

Spearhead

£1.50

No. 422

APRIL 2004

ISSN 1364-7105



MAD AND DANGEROUS

See ANTONY MILNE'S view of the Government's immigration policy (pages 18 & 19)

WHAT WE THINK

Not muddle – policy!

For some time, we have been saying that the apparently uncontrolled flood of immigrants into Britain is not the result of mere confusion (though there is quite enough of the latter from what must surely be the most incompetent government in our history); the flood is a matter of quite conscious policy, shaped by New Labour's fanatical internationalist outlook and its obeisance to its paymasters in powerful places. Writer and journalist Peter Hitchens has described it as the deliberate 'Abolition of Britain', though Hitchens himself has taken care not to introduce the racial dimension into his arguments. A race-mixing programme for all white nations is the order of the day – as dictated by the globalists, to whom prime ministers, presidents, cabinets and parliaments are mere puppets.

A few years ago such an assertion would have sounded cranky, and there may still be people around today who would dismiss it as such; but the naked facts of what is happen-

Nationalist comment

ing increasingly underline the truth of it.

Last month, one Steve Moxon, a hitherto obscure *apparatchik* working in the Sheffield office of the Immigration & Nationality Directorate, hit national headlines by blowing the whistle on what he discovered to be a deliberate government policy of fast-forwarding settlement applications by many thousands of would-be immigrants while bypassing the rule under which their backgrounds are supposed to be examined. The applicants have been given permission to stay in Britain on the claim that they are skilled, wealth-creating migrants, but the checks necessary to establish this in each case have been abandoned on instructions from high up in the Government!

Said Mr. Moxon in a press statement:-

"I've granted residency to people who should never in a million years have been allowed into this country. It was clear to me that a staged withdrawal from immigration rules was taking place as far as these applications were concerned. The checks were being diluted and diluted to the point where no rules whatsoever were being applied."

At the same time Moxon produced evidence that there is a clear policy to hush up these new procedures. A memo to civil servants has ordered them not to make any mention of the policy. It said: "As this is *not* a published policy... no reference should be made to this."

In other words, don't let the British public know what is happening! While the Government continues to keep up a public posture of controlling immigration and exer-

cising strict supervision over applications, it is in fact doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. Moxon has in the meantime been suspended from his job and says he expects in due course to be fired. The only thing that might prevent this is the Government's fear that he could in that event feel able to speak even more freely and frankly about the scandal than he has done so far.

We use the word advisedly but what we are witnessing here is a *conspiracy* – just one small feature of a conspiracy that is really much larger and involves the planned racial destruction of our country, but an important and revealing feature nevertheless. And for that we should be grateful to this civil servant who had the courage to speak out.

His Master's Voice speaks

Tony Blair astounded and seriously worried even many of his most loyal supporters last month when he went further than he has ever gone before in his embrace of globalism, world government and international meddling. Speaking in defence of his decision to take the country into the war in Iraq, he called for a new framework of international law that would make it easier for 'democracies' to oust 'tyrannies'. He said:-

"It may well be that under international law as presently constituted a régime can systematically brutalise and oppress its people and there is nothing we can do.

"This may be the law, but should it be? If it is a global threat, it needs a global response, based on global rules."

What the Prime Minister was, in effect, saying was that new globalist legislation was needed which would entitle certain self-appointed keepers of global order and 'democracy' to intervene in the affairs of sovereign states whose conduct of their affairs was not satisfactory to those keepers. This, inevitably, meant military action if no other form of pressure worked. It meant that any leader or government anywhere whom the globalists did not like could be overthrown as if by prescriptive right of the overthrowers.

Of course, when Tony referred to régimes 'brutalising' and 'oppressing' their peoples what he really meant was régimes which, not meeting the approval of folk like him, could be presented as brutalising and oppressing their peoples by an orchestrated mass media onslaught, using any fabricated stories coming to hand. If Tony and his globalist masters had no particular axe to grind against a régime, its rulers could go on brutalising and oppressing to their hearts' content. It would all depend on essentially *political* considerations. Thus the kind of laws Tony was suggesting would not apply to Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe; nor would they apply

Spearhead

No. 422 APRIL 2004

PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT

Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and should not be taken as representing the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of the month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse, without giving reasons, to publish any advertisement submitted. The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts for articles for possible publication. The most useful lengths are of around 1,000 to 1,850 words. *Spearhead* is currently produced using Serif PagePlus 6 software. Articles sent on 3.5" computer disk will be welcome if compatible. To ensure acceptance, however, they should also be sent in printed or typewritten format. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or in any other way amend articles submitted for publication.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles in other publications should ensure when doing so to give public acknowledgement to both the writer and *Spearhead* and to include in the acknowledgement the magazine's full address.

to Ariel Sharon in Israel. These régimes, you see, are politically 'acceptable', whereas those like that of Saddam Hussein in Iraq are not. Hence the need for military action, where necessary, to enforce the globalists' will – in some cases but not others. You get the idea?

Hush up the facts!

The number of HIV cases in Glasgow is rising fast because of immigration from Africa. In 2002-03 there were 85 new cases in the area, an increase of 77 per cent over the previous year and double the figure for the year before that.

One would have thought that the public health authorities would view this matter as one of the utmost seriousness and designate the protection of the populace from such a hazard as being an absolute priority. But no! Public statements have been designed deliberately to obfuscate and mislead. The Scottish Centre for Infection & Environmental Health just says that the majority of new cases are resulting from people getting the disease abroad and bringing it to Scotland with them. The impression given here is one of Scots travelling to Africa and becoming HIV-positive when there rather than of Africans arriving in Britain and bringing it with them. So why are the proper facts concerning the identities of the carriers not made known? Prof. David Goldberg, who oversees HIV and AIDS monitoring, says: "That is information that we have not published because it is felt that it is not appropriate. We have to take into account the potential for racism, xenophobia, etc."

Sheila McLean, professor of medical law and ethics at Glasgow University, agrees. She says that the only reason she can think of for knowing the HIV figures would be to encourage prejudice against non-Whites.

So preventing 'racism' is more important than protecting the public from the AIDS virus. Thank you, Professors Goldberg and McLean, for letting us know!

Chasing the pink vote

We have already advised readers that the new Tory régime of Michael Howard (real name Michael Hecht) is likely to be even 'wetter' and more liberal and politically correct than the previous Duncan Smith one – and that is really saying something! It was reported in *The Sunday Times* of March 14th that later in the month there would be a summit conference in Westminster, attended by representatives of homosexual organisations from all over the country and abroad, whose agenda would be to open up 'dialogue' between the Tory Party and the 'gay' community and thus (although this was not specifically stated) endear the Tories to 'gay'

electors.

As part of all this, a number of policy initiatives have been launched. One is to appoint an 'anti-homophobic' officer for every school (cost to the taxpayer not detailed). Another is to legislate against insurance firms discriminating against 'gay' men (lesbians apparently not included but no doubt that will come).

Meanwhile, Commander Brian Paddick, Britain's highest-ranking openly 'gay' police officer, has been invited to talks about 'hate' crime against 'gays' and lesbians (good to know that here the latter are not forgotten!).

According to the *Sunday Times* report:-

"The search for gay-friendly policies to include in the party's manifesto for the next election follows a radical shift in its attitude towards gays and lesbians since Howard became leader.

"In a keynote speech last month the Tory leader backed plans for a form of 'gay marriage' by signalling his support for civil partnership rights for same-sex couples..."

"The spirit of inclusiveness has also been reflected in the party's apparent increased willingness to select openly gay people as candidates."

Should we be outraged? It would be natural if we were, but in fact we should be pleased. All this puts a label firmly on the Tory Party which can leave no doubt as to where it stands and what it has become. Not a single lesson from its failures in the recent past has been learned. It staggers blindly on, oblivious to the reasons why it is so little loved by Middle Britain, and ever more anxious to imitate its Labour rival. And to those who want *real* political change in Britain this is all to the good.

The real point about the Gibson film

Up to now we have not seen Mel Gibson's controversial production *The Passion of the Christ*, and so cannot comment on its merits as a work of the film-maker's art. It may be very good. It may be awful. But this misses the real point in the controversy.

The real point is Mr. Gibson's right to make the film and the right of the public around the world to see it and judge it for themselves. Over the past months there has been a furious argument over this fundamental issue, and this argument tells us much more about what is going on in the world than Mr. Gibson could ever have told us in the film itself.

The great heresy of the film is that, in its portrayal of the death of Christ and the events leading up to it, it reflects ungenerously (and possibly inaccurately) on the Jews. Well, so what? The same Mel Gibson

played leading roles as an actor in two films, *Braveheart* and *The Patriot*, which many would feel reflected very ungenerously on the English in one case and the British generally (though the English mostly) in the other. Both of these films were extremely careless in their treatment of historical truth but the British, and especially the English, were expected not to mind – and indeed most of us didn't mind, though perhaps we should have done. At least, none of us suggested for one second that the films should not be allowed to be produced and shown. Britain, America and most of the other countries where they were put on view are supposed to be 'democracies' – that is countries where films are shown which might delight some people and greatly offend others. Thus it has always been. That is what film production and distribution in free societies are all about.

Hollywood has for the past 60-odd years been churning out thousands upon thousands of films dealing with World War II which are extremely ungenerous in their portrayal of Germans – certain Germans, at least, if not all Germans – just as *The Passion* was apparently ungenerous in its portrayal of certain, though not all, Jews. Aside from this, the historical accuracy of many of these films might be disputed just as the historical accuracy of *The Passion* is disputed.

Germans today might take offence at these World War II films from the standpoint both of their ethnic stereotyping and of their historical accuracy. Yet they are not expected to do so, and wherever and whenever they do they are dismissed as incorrigible nazi apologists who are not worth listening to.

But apparently it is quite legitimate for Jews all over the world to be outraged at the production and showing of Gibson's *Passion*, and indeed to demand that it be withdrawn from distribution – all on the grounds that it might incite racial hatred against Jews and is anyway not factually accurate – whereas it would not be legitimate for Brits or Germans to demand the banning of *Braveheart* and *The Patriot*, in the one case, and thousands of World War II (and not a few World War I) films in the other case – even supposing they were intolerant enough to do so.

That, readers, is the real point about *The Passion*. Think on it.

Another sell-out planned?

It was reported last month that the Alvis company, which makes the world-beating Challenger 2 tank, is targeted for takeover by the American firm General Dynamics, the producer of the Abrams tank, which, like the Challenger, was used in Iraq. It is generally known that the Challenger outperformed the Abrams in that conflict.

Which makes it fairly certain that our Government will happily authorise the deal!

THE LESSON OF MADRID

WHEN news first broke of the appalling bomb explosions at the Atocha railway station in Madrid last month, killing at least 200, our first reaction was to question whether it could have been the work of Al-Qaida or some similarly oriented Muslim group – or whether it was an outrage engineered by Zionists allied to the neo-cons surrounding President Bush, and calculated to land Al-Qaida with the blame and thus justify an escalation of the Bush/Blair 'war on terror', involving perhaps further military action against sovereign states unfriendly to the 'New World Order'.


Further consideration renders the latter explanation unlikely in this case, and therefore we can regard the most probable source of the attack as being an Islamic one. Reports that a group allied to Al-Qaida have acknowledged responsibility should not be taken as gospel proof of this – the media can manufacture any story that suits the interests controlling them – but the simple question of benefit and loss points overwhelmingly in that direction.

SPAIN REJECTS THE BUSH WAY

Very shortly after the Madrid explosions, the Spanish voters spoke, decisively rejecting former Premier José Maria Aznar and his *Partido Popular* party and their policy of alignment with the Bush/Blair war against Iraq. Whatever the moral considerations involved in the bombings – and here we simply cannot judge Arab/Muslim actions by European criteria – the outrage and its consequences constituted a massive political victory for Al-Qaida and a decisive defeat for the NWO coalition. That it took the deaths of over 200 innocent people to bring this about was tragic in the extreme, but the fact must be faced, and we must hope that out of the tragedy some good will come.

One good that has undoubtedly been manifest is that a number of scribblers of the gutter press, hirelings of the powerful interests that direct globalism, have well and truly exposed themselves and the cause they espouse. They have called the Spanish voters 'cowardly' by failing to support "the war on terror." Andrew Sullivan, in *The Sunday Times* (21.3.04), accused them of "caving in to blackmail." Michael Portillo, elsewhere in the same paper, wrote that "Spain has shrunk." Daniel Hannan, in *The Sunday Telegraph* on the same day, spoke of new

Premier Zapatero's pledge to pull Spanish forces out of Iraq as a "betrayal" and went on with similar nonsense about Spain revisiting its "abject past."



Spain: New Premier José Zapatero, seen here at the moment of victory, was the beneficiary of a massive protest against the nation's involvement in the Iraq War.

In fact, what the Spanish people showed in the wake of the Madrid disaster was not cowardice but sound common sense. They failed to see why Spanish lives should be further risked in a war that was of the making of the US President and had nothing to do with their own country. They did not fall for the squalid confidence trick that told them that all the western nations were terrorist targets just because they were western; they understood that they had been targeted because their previous government had supported an unprovoked and unjustified attack on a sovereign state.

CONTAGIOUS

One particular reason why the Bush/Blair and neo-con lobby and their supporters in the media are in a state of such chagrin at the result of the Spanish election is that they realise that it has struck a massive blow against their entire global strategy and that, politically, it is likely to become contagious – with perhaps similar results in other countries, even possibly Britain and the United States.

The perceptive American commentator Sam Francis has said on his website *SF Online* that...

"... what we ought to learn from the Madrid bombing is that the war on terrorism as Mr. Bush and his advisers have designed it not only has not been won but is not winnable at all. It is not possible for the government or any government to capture or kill every person willing and able to make and plant bombs capable of inflicting enormous damage and loss of life. Nor is it possible for the government to protect every conceivable target the terrorists may choose to strike. If you protect planes and airports, they will attack trains and train stations. If you protect trains they will attack shopping malls. If you protect shopping malls, they will attack bridges, office buildings, public parks, theatres... At least the Spaniards have learned something, at a bloody price. Americans should too."

What this message says is if that we cannot stop the terror itself we must remove the cause of the terror. That means, in affect, the abandonment of globalism, support of Israel and the role of 'world policeman'. Politicians in Britain please note!

The things they're saying

I believe that more and more people have come to appreciate that multi-culturalism is a divisive and demoralising doctrine. It is – truly – cultural relativism, and nobody in his or her heart is truly a cultural or moral relativist.

Multi-culturalism, like that other dangerous 'ism', communism, is based on a mistaken idea of human nature. Multi-culturalism has accentuated the differences between people, not their similarities and shared purpose.

MINETTE MARRIN
The Sunday Times (7.3.04)

Having had two active service stints in Basra and being about to return there, I must make it clear that the majority of the British armed forces either take offence or think it's hilarious when they hear of the likes of suicide bombers Omar Sharif and Asif Hanif – or those who were recently released from Guantanamo Bay, Jamal Al Harith, Ruhul Ahmed, Shafiq Rasul and Asif Iqbal – referred to as 'British'.

Perhaps this sound racist, but my comrades in arms and I take a view which seems very different from some of those held by civilians. Maybe this is because we're more keenly aware that we've lost five dozen of our own lads – and several hundred of our US brothers.

Such people might have been born in the UK, but that's as far as it goes. They keep themselves separate and obey different laws. To accept them as Britons simply because they were born here is beyond the pale.

Major C. BLACKTHORNE
Letter in Daily Mail (17.3.04)

I heard Michael Howard on the radio the other day speaking, yet again, about limiting the number of asylum-seekers trying to enter this country. Given his own Romanian-Jewish heritage, is he really saying that we don't want any more people like him entering the UK? Maybe he's right.

HUGH MAXWELL
Letter in The Times (25.2.04)

This week, the appalling multiple bombings in Madrid – killing nearly 200 innocent civilians and wounding hundreds more – cast a new and lurid light on the state of the so-called 'war against terror' a year after President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair launched their invasion of Iraq, allegedly to make the world a safer place...

... the world is in no way a safer place because Saddam has been toppled. Far from it: the global rate of terrorist attack has actually speeded up since the Anglo-American invasion.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA

So the adventure on which Bush and Blair embarked with such high hopes a year ago has turned out to be a political and security quagmire, costly in treasure and blood.

CORRELLI BARNETT
Daily Mail (13.3.04)

After the months of fruitless work by David Kay and the Iraq Survey group, and the interrogations of Saddam and almost all of his senior henchmen, no new information on weapons of mass destruction has come forward and the violent attacks continue. One has to ask the question: what or who else is left to provide the answers?

Perhaps Saddam has been answering but his information has been kept secret for security reasons. That seems unlikely. London and Washington desperately need visible progress on the weapons of mass destruction issue and need to be seen making inroads in reducing the insecurity in Iraq. Surely something would have leaked onto the front pages of our newspapers and into television news bulletins by now?

The truth, I suspect, is more stark. Saddam's capture has yielded little of practical value to the occupation of Iraq.

RAGEH OMAAR
The Sunday Times News Review (21.3.04)

Mr. Blair wants to play Richard the Lionheart against 'the menace of Islamic extremism'. He wants to be Churchill warning that the current war is not over, but is 'only the end of the beginning'. He craves to be a war leader. But he is no Richard and no Churchill and this is no war. His self-image has led him into a mire of dodgy dossiers, dodgier law, scare-mongering, spin and sanctimony. The Prime Minister is simply out of his depth.

SIMON JENKINS
The Spectator (13.3.04)

George W. Bush seeks to use September 11 atrocities in the coming election. Yes, let him. And let his opponents publish a map of his strange, panicking, zig-zag journey to nowhere while he dithered and did nothing on the day itself. The same goes for Mr. Blair. Every time he rages on about the perils of terror, he needs to be reminded of his craven surrender to the terror of the IRA – a surrender that is now rapidly unravelling.

PETER HITCHENS
The Mail on Sunday (7.3.04)

Instead of facing the reality of what the IRA was, which, to be fair, it has with monotonous brutality never ceased to remind us of, the British and the Irish governments preferred appeasement and the most demean-

ing forms of flattery. A senior MI5 officer, who was responsible for constructing the peace process, on television once even described Martin McGuinness as being just like an SAS officer...

The impossible had been essayed. And in the process of pushing this anvil up a wall of wet ice, enormous and probably irreparable damage was done to Northern Ireland society. Absolute power was passed to republican paramilitaries, which now govern their one-party statelets with a rod of iron...

Northern Ireland is now probably more divided than at any time in its history: the political middle ground has been almost wiped out, the police force has been broken, the unionist people demoralised and the productive economy is in ruins.

KEVIN MYERS
The Sunday Telegraph (14.3.04)

"Russia needs to be ruled by an iron hand. Life was better when we had less freedom. What has all this talk about democracy done for us? Nothing. I would even be in favour of closing down the borders. Putin is a strong leader. That's what we need.

DINA DENISOVA
Reported in The Sunday Times (14.3.04)

Britain is in a desperate decline. Tony Blair holds Parliament in contempt and the Home Secretary hasn't a clue how many illegal immigrants are here.

There's an explosion in gun crime and many inner-city areas are unsafe. Our educational system is letting down our youngsters and further education is no longer free. NHS treatment is a lottery, and we are now lagging behind other EU countries in medical care.

We have succumbed to dumbing down and political correctness.

F. HENDERSON
Letter to Daily Express (27.2.04)

I was invited to dinner with Blair recently, but to be frank he wasn't that bright. He took an interest in what I was saying, and has this ability to make it seem as if he cares, but he didn't seem particularly knowledgeable about anything.

I was asking him about his links with America, and he didn't seem certain about what he was saying. He asked me lots of questions about what I thought, but his responses to my questions were slow.

The subject he got most animated about was beach volleyball.

BARBARA CASSANI
To 'Spy', The Daily Telegraph (23.3.04)

As most of you know, last month Mr. Michael Hecht, otherwise known as Michael Howard, otherwise known as the leader of the Tory Party, granted this town of Burnley the dubious honour of a visit.

My wife and I were watching on TV as Mr. Howard arrived at his meeting, got out of his car and went into the hall. There were 'ethnics' to the right of him, 'ethnics' to the left of him, 'ethnics' in front of him and 'ethnics' behind him. We watched as he spoke at the meeting. First we started counting the ethnic minorities on the platform with him but then we decided it would be easier to count the Whites!

Mr. Hecht set the tone for his speech in his opening words – and I quote:-

"It was good to hear from Simon Woolley from Operation Black Vote. Operation Black Vote is an important organisation which encourages more people from our ethnic communities to take part in politics. We in the Conservative party support their work..."

"I am also very pleased to see Yousuf Bhailok from the Muslim Council of Britain... I am also very grateful to Saladin Chaudry, the Consul General of Pakistan, for attending."

With these words, Mr. Hecht – sorry, Howard – was making it very clear what his priorities were, whom he was most intent on pleasing. (laughter).

Mr. Howard went on to say that "Burnley has a long and proud history," and he mentioned the town's tradition of coal mining, cotton manufacturing and engineering. He pointed out that in 1886 it was the biggest producer of cotton cloth in the world. "The decline of such industries," he said soothingly, "caused real hardship for many people in Burnley."

Crocodile tears! That's all I can say: crocodile tears! What Mr. Howard failed to mention was that it was mainly the policies of his own party when in government that caused that very decline. Burnley was part of an area extending over Central and East Lancashire to West Yorkshire which was once the industrial centre of the world. Nearly all of that has been destroyed – destroyed by the economics of globalism, the very economic policies supported by his party and all the other mainstream parties today. And all he can do is speak regretfully of 'hardship' – as if it couldn't be helped! It *could* have been helped, but neither Tory Governments nor Labour Governments were willing to provide the help. They sat back and just let foreign producers steal our markets without lifting a finger to support our own industries. And now, to cap it all, they've allowed what is left of the Lancashire cotton goods industry to be swallowed up by Asians!

Next, Mr. Howard, referring to Burnley, spoke of the disturbances of three years ago "that shocked us all." Shocked? Was Mr.

That Burnley speech

TYNDALL ANSWERS Mr. HECHT

Howard surprised? Was his party surprised? What happened in Burnley in the Summer of 2001 was a disaster just waiting to happen.

Reproduced here, very slightly abridged, is the speech given by our editor at the meeting of Burnley British National Party on March 4th 2004. A report of the remainder of the meeting can be found elsewhere in this issue.

The portents of it had been boiling up for a long time. His party when in government – just as much as the Labour Party – had



TYNDALL
Slammed Tory leader for 'ethnic grovelling'.

allowed towns like Burnley to be flooded with Third World immigrants over a period of more than forty years. They had seen the racial tension building up in those towns as

the newcomers moved in and the native inhabitants had to make way for them. No one but an idiot doubted that this tension would eventually explode. The only surprise was that it didn't happen a great deal earlier than it did. Mr. Howard's party – and the Labour Party – were responsible. They should have seen it coming. They made certain it would come. And Mr. Howard says he's 'shocked'!

Blame for Burnley's problems

What next? I quote Mr. Howard:-

"That turned the spotlight on the town and its problems. They are serious problems. The town is home to some of the most deprived local government wards in the country. Four out of ten homes in Burnley are dependent on some kind of state benefit. Four out of ten children are eligible for school meals. People in Burnley suffer disproportionately from ill health, high levels of teenage pregnancy and low levels of educational achievement."

Just like that! And has all this happened after Tony Blair and New Labour came to power in 1997? Were none of these things present before? Are the Tories in no way to blame? The truth is that the social ills that Mr. Howard was speaking of have been building up over a long, long time – in fact for a much longer time during periods of Tory Government than in periods of Labour Government. But you'd think the Tories had nothing to do with it!

Mr. Howard went on to say:-

"There is too much crime... And people here believe that criminals all too often escape punishment."

Again, did all this start when Labour came to power in 1997? Was this a lovely, peaceful, law-abiding country before that? Was Burnley a peaceful, law-abiding town? And were criminals not escaping punishment during the last period of Tory Government?

And that's not all. Let's remember who was Home Secretary during that very Tory Government – when criminals were running rampant, crime was going through the roof and punishments for crime were wholly inadequate even when the criminals were caught. It was Mr. Howard himself! But now he expects the people to have short memories, so short that they don't recall his own lamentable record when in office – only a few years ago.

Next, Mr. Howard said: "I have come here today to listen and to learn from local people."

Really! Is Mr. Howard going to listen to the eight and a half thousand people who voted BNP in last year's council elections? Is he going to listen to the people in Burnley who have had their neighbourhoods made into alien territory through the flood of immigrants? Is he going to listen to the women and old folk who cannot walk the streets in safety because of the tensions brought about by multi-racialism – the very multi-racialism that his own party has done so much to promote? To get an idea of the kind of people Mr. Howard intends to listen to one only has to take note of the names he mentioned when he began his speech. One only has to note the people thronging his platform. Mr. Howard came here to listen to the ethnic minorities, not the ordinary British people of Burnley. And as for learning, the fact is that he and his party over all these years have learned *nothing*. They've learned nothing from the riots of three years ago – otherwise they would have come out with a firm policy for stopping immigration, putting an end to multi-racialism and getting the immigrants to go home to where they came from! (*loud applause*).

Tory record on education and crime

Mr. Howard went on to say:-

"Most parents in Burnley... recognise that the chance of a decent education lies at the core of any community."

Decent education? So what did the Tories do for education all the years they were in office – 18 years, to be exact? It was during those very years that educational standards in this country plummeted to the appalling levels we see now. It was during those years that the schools and universities became more and more dumbed down. It was during those years that discipline declined and learning went out of the window. It was during those years that 'political correctness' ran amok. Is Mr. Howard trying to kid us that all this started with Tony Blair? Granted, Blair's Government has made things no better. But it all started a long, long time ago. In fact, education has been on the skids in this country ever since the 1960s, when all the new-fangled nonsense about 'progressive' education came in. And the Tories have

done nothing whatever to stop it.

But Mr. Howard wasn't finished. Next he was saying:-

"Towns like Burnley need effective policing... As Burnley knows, much crime is drug-related. That is why we are pledged to increase tenfold the number of drug rehabilitation places..."

Is that all? Is that really the best Mr. Hecht can come up with? Drug rehabilitation places! This is just tickling at the drug problem. We won't see any really serious moves to deal with the drug problem until every drug-peddler is hanging from every gallows in every prison up and down this country! (*storm of applause*).

BNP-bashing time

But now Mr. Hecht starts to get down to the real nitty-gritty. He says:-

"But there is a specific reason why I have come to Burnley. I want to address directly what I see as a stain on our democratic way of life: the British National Party."

Democratic way of life? If you ask me what democracy means I will suggest that it means government carrying out the people's will. On one issue after another – immigration, Europe, capital punishment, to name a few – successive governments have defied the will of the British people, whereas the BNP has echoed the will of the British people. And what is undemocratic about the BNP? It contests elections in the democratic manner and observes the verdict of the people in those elections. It operates strictly according to the rules of democracy. And, unlike the left, it respects the right of its opponents to free speech. The BNP has never attempted to interfere with the democratic process in respect of those rights, whereas there is a long record of the left trying to interfere with the rights of the BNP, sometimes by violent means. If Mr. Howard is looking for people who are a 'stain on democracy' he's looking in the wrong direction! (*applause*).

But let's see what Mr. Howard/Hecht says next. He says:-

"The policies of the British National Party are based on bigotry and hatred. Its approach is entirely alien to our political traditions."

Well, I suggest that Mr. Hecht get hold of a dictionary and looks up the word 'bigotry'. He'll find that it means a *blind* commitment to an idea, irrespective of the evidence. Our views on race – which I am sure are what Mr. Howard has in mind – are based on *experience* and *observation*; they are not 'blind'. As for 'hatred', I challenge Mr. Howard to produce a single piece of evidence that we've expressed hatred against anybody. A single leaflet. A single news-

paper or magazine article. A single speech. A single banner or poster. If we had, we'd be arrested and jailed.

Who is 'alien'?

And as for the word 'alien', who does Mr. Howard – Mr. Hecht – think he is, as a second-generation immigrant in Britain, talking about what's 'alien'? Many people might feel that he's an alien. (Hear Hear!). That isn't his fault, of course, but it does mean he should be careful about talking about who and what are 'alien' in this country. This is our country. Most of our ancestors have been tilling the soil or working in the factories here for many hundreds of years – during which time Mr. Howard's ancestors have been somewhere else. I think we know better than Mr. Howard knows what's 'alien' to our traditions! (*loud applause*).

And you'll note that Mr. Howard speaks of 'our' traditions. Who does he mean by 'our'? Does he mean the indigenous British people? Or does he mean his own Jewish people? We may well be 'alien' to Jewish traditions, but that's something I shall lose no sleep over. They're entitled to their traditions, but they shouldn't be lecturing to us about *our* traditions. (*applause*).

Which party has the most crooks?

Mr. Howard then went on to talk about certain 'offences' by people in the BNP. Well, there isn't a single political party that can claim that none of its members have ever broken the law. Let's look at Mr. Howard's own party – the Tories. For a start, there's Lady Porter, one-time Tory head of Westminster Council in London. She was involved in the famous 'homes-for-votes' scandal back in the 1990s, in which people were allocated council housing in accordance with the party they were likely to vote for, not in accordance with need. She was surcharged £37 million and hopped it to Israel, where she still is – out of the reach of British justice.

Then there were Jeffrey Archer (Tory Party Chairman) and Jonathan Aitken (Tory Cabinet Minister). Both were sent to jail for perjury – for *lying*. Yes, I was sent to jail myself once too. But I was sent to jail for *telling the truth*. That was back in 1986 when I was juggled for writing and publishing things in *Spearhead* magazine that the powers that be didn't like – things about race and immigration. What I said was the truth, but these days they tell us the truth is no defence. And all this happened under a Tory Government. I've never told lies. I've never perjured myself in court. I know of no one in a leading position in the BNP who has. And Mr. Howard has the nerve to talk about 'offences'!

And while we're talking about offences,

Contd. overleaf

TYNDALL ANSWERS

Mr. HECHT

(Contd. from prev. page)

what about Labour? The Labour Party has recently selected as a candidate for Reading East a man who has two offences for indecent exposure (to other men) in the vicinity of public toilets. What has Mr. Howard got to say about that? So far I've heard nothing!

The Tories – in fact all the mainstream parties – love to take the moral high ground when talking about the BNP, but let's look at them! I think that today when you look behind the facades of the parties of the establishment you are like someone lifting up a large stone that has been in place for many years. When the stone is moved what you find is an incredible maze of repulsive insect life crawling about underneath – blinded by the light of day and scurrying for cover. The establishment today is just like that. The establishment today is a cesspool of filth and corruption, kept going by lies, lies and more lies. Let's look at some further lies from Mr. Howard. In his Burnley speech he said:-

"For centuries, Britain has welcomed energetic, ambitious and optimistic people from every part of the world... We are a stronger and better country, rich in our cultural diversity, because of the immigrant communities that have settled here."

That is dishonest nonsense! Welcomed! Who has done the welcoming? Have the British people welcomed the newcomers? The British people have never been asked! The welcome has come from the politicians. *They've* decided the immigrants should come here, not people like you or I.

And what about 'enrichment'? What about our becoming a stronger and better country? Lies and nonsense again! Why doesn't Mr. Howard come to Burnley and really look around – not just make a speech, hobnob with his 'ethnic' friends and then go home? Why doesn't he speak to the real people of this town about the 'enrichment' they are supposed to have enjoyed? We saw some of that 'enrichment' in the Summer of 2001. Mr. Howard says he was shocked by this, but this was the consequence of his party's policy of allowing Third World immigration. In earlier times Burnley experienced poverty, but the people didn't riot. It was the Asians who rioted, Mr. Howard. So much for 'enrichment'! (storm of applause).

What price the NHS?

But Mr. Howard wasn't finished. He said next:-

"This country now boasts hugely successful black British and Asian British entrepreneurs, black cabinet ministers and senior black and Asian police officers. Our national health service depends in

HOWARD'S RICH 'DIVERSITY'

Burnley burns as Asians riot in 2001. Burnley Whites have had many grievances over the years but they haven't rioted.



part on the talents of immigrants."

To which some will immediately say: Yes, and even your own party admits that it's one of the most inefficient health services in the developed world. Black and Asian cabinet ministers and police officers? Yes, and it's the politicians who have put them there. Is Mr. Howard seriously trying to tell us that these people have reached their positions by merit? They've been deliberately elevated by a policy of positive discrimination and political correctness. They've been picked because they're black and Asian, not because they're the best for the job! Everybody knows this. Who are you trying to kid, Mr. Howard? (applause).

The 'thug' charge

But Mr. Howard really excelled himself when he got back onto the subject of the BNP and called us "thugs dressed up as a political party." Thugs! The fact is that the BNP, more than any of the parties, has been the *victim* of thuggery – day in, day out, over many years. Mr. Howard knows it. The Labour leaders know it. Let's just take one example. When the eight newly elected BNP councillors arrived at the council chamber for their first meeting last year they were subjected to vicious and cowardly attacks by the thugs of the left, including some of Mr. Howard's 'ethnic' friends. Some of them were women, some were elderly. It was a disgusting exhibition of thuggery at its worst – but did we hear Mr. Howard, or any of the top Tories, condemning it? We did not! (*cries of 'shame'!*).

Considering the thuggish behaviour of our party's opponents, again and again, across the years and across the land, I believe that the behaviour of our own members has been a miracle of restraint. That's why I repudiate utterly the lying allegations of Michael Howard about "thugs dressed up as a political party."

Mr. Howard's speech in Burnley last month was one big disgusting grovel to the ethnic minorities, particularly the Asians. And it was all for one reason. Michael Howard came here to get the Asian vote. And that is the main preoccupation of the big party leaders nowadays – the ethnic minority vote. Whites? They're just second-class citizens in the eyes of the politicians. They don't give a damn about them. Only the BNP gives a damn!

They're running scared!

But Mr. Howard's visit and speech have demonstrated one thing. The Tories are scared of us. They're all running scared of the BNP. They're *terrified* of the BNP!

And well they might be! We now have a strong base of popular support in this town. We have the chance to expand it in the local government elections in June, and that's why I know that everyone here will be making an extra special effort.

But here's a note of caution. Whatever effort we make in the elections in June, it may not be enough. A lot of things decide how elections go, and our efforts are only a part. Politics are not one big joyride forwards and upwards. Politics involve setbacks, disappointments. Sometimes the throw of the dice goes in your favour, sometimes not: Mature parties learn to accept this and don't get demoralised when things don't go according to plan, when results don't live up to expectations.

This political struggle has always been a slow process, sometimes painful, most of the time three steps forward and two steps back. What I urge on everyone here is not to become demoralised if this year's election results are not as good as we all hope. We shall live to fight again, regardless. We are not 'fair-weather' patriots. We'll be back.

Because there's one thing working for us all the time. A tide of history is flowing in our direction. All over the world, including this country, nationalism is the wave of the future. Globalism, liberalism, multi-racialism are on the retreat – discredited, abandoned by millions of people. It's happening in France, Belgium, Austria, Italy – even in Australia. Our time is coming. Their time is past. If we have a setback, it's only temporary. *Nothing* can stop the nationalist tide. *Nothing* can stop the tide of the BNP. So let us send out this final message to Michael Howard and his Tory Party – and all the others: Well might you fear us, because one day – before too long – we're going to put an end to your treason, your betrayal, your corruption. One day, we're going to take this country from you – the country you've disgraced – and we're going to build it up again to the great land it once was: strong, proud, free – and *white!* (*standing ovation*).

MOST people's 'window on the world' these days is the television screen, so their perception and understanding of events beyond their immediate locality is heavily influenced by those governing the content of television programmes. It follows that TV controllers should be above reproach in their efforts to avoid news distortion and tendentious programmes and to defend basic freedoms. However, the present controllers' abuse of public trust is apparent from the most cursory inspection of TV (and radio) output.

All public companies and public services are subject to regular independent audits of their finances to ensure public funds are not abused. But much more than financial propriety is at issue when dealing with the huge power and influence of the mass media in today's world. What price 'press freedom' if it is used to enslave everybody else? There is now an overwhelming case for a genuinely independent 'Media Management Audit' with the following remit:-

1. To establish a code of practice whereby:-
 - a) No political party will be discussed in the absence of its representatives.
 - b) Any bona fide political party will be given media space to rebut misreporting of its policies, membership or behaviour, this space to be equal to that given to those doing the misreporting.
 - c) 'Due proportion' should apply to the amount of media space given to particular topics and participants in programmes.
 - d) Gratuitous insertion of obscenity, violence and profanity will be prohibited.
 - e) 'Outside' assessors will be involved in the recruitment and selection of media personnel and the drawing up of their contracts of employment.
 - f) Entertainment programmes will not be used as vehicles for political or pressure group propaganda.
 - g) Media output will be regularly monitored to ensure conformity with the above rules.
2. To recommend desirable amendments to broadcasting policy and practice.

The views of media employees should be disregarded when establishing these regulatory arrangements, for the same reason that the main planks of political policy are not subject to approval by civil servants. What has to be addressed is the tendency of some media personnel to shape media output to accord with their own political, moral and aesthetic perceptions. For obvious reasons, this subversion is obliged to conceal itself, so media manipulators use the most popular programmes as vehicles for the promotion of certain political or social causes which, baldly stated, would not stand up to public challenge.

ALL 'VIRTUAL REALITY'

Thus we find fictionalised versions of reality in which, for example, Negroes, Asians and females are slotted into unfamiliar (because unrealistic) roles, and the plot tends to diminish or marginalise heterosexual white males as primitive bigots or ineffectual wimps. They follow Hollywood/ Sollywood/ Gollywood in

the promotion of blacks and sexy females in grotesquely unlikely roles from crime-solving to space exploration and national leadership.

As seen on TV

FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON looks at the fantasy world portrayed by the czars of the silver screen and calls for radical reforms in the way the media are governed

Such productions bear the same relation to reality as a Disney cartoon. Pointing to the odd Black or female seeming to contradict this assertion is simply a case of the exception proving the rule. For example, few people would recognise the frequent description of the American politician Colin Powell as 'black', when he is patently of mixed race. And who seriously believes that, with thousands of more eligible white males, the eight-strong crew of a billion-dollar space mission had to include black and female members as the best available people and not as politically-correct window-dressing? So proportional representation – a favourite liberal mantra – is nowhere to be found when multi-racism or feminism are being promoted. Some risible examples follow:-

- An unquotable Negro 'poet' presenting the prize to the (all-white) winners of the *University Challenge* quiz programme.
- A Negress explaining natural history to (all-white) children in an English meadow.
- A Negro presiding over a classical (all-white) piano competition.
- A film scene depicting a Negress teaching Shakespeare to (mostly white) American students.
- Space exploration film dramas with Negroes in leading technological roles.
- 'Saving the world' film epics with Negroes in leading roles.
- 'Screen-filler' Negroes in most *Coronation Street* pub scenes and even rural *Emmerdale* scenarios.
- War films depicting Negroes in 'under-cover'(!) operations against the Nazis.
- A film scene about Vikings including a Negro.
- A Robin Hood film where the (valiant and sagacious) 'Saracen' visitor is actually not Arab but black.

Similar examples are now commonplace,

and all are intended to promote the notion that nothing of importance can happen anywhere without the inclusion of Blacks, Asians and females. And TV advertisers are blatantly pursuing the same agenda, so that Blacks are nowadays becoming an obligatory presence whenever two or more people are on screen; indeed, Blacks are sometimes the *only* people presenting the product. Another insidious example of this advertising *genre* is the inclusion of Blacks in most tea party or Christmas scenes or children's garden games. Yet another example is the inclusion of Blacks in boardroom scenes. The 'sermon on the screen' is therefore essentially the same as the pulpit variety in seeking to promote a particular version of the world.

'ALL MULTI-RACIALISTS'

Obviously following the example of a predecessor (Lord Hill), who once claimed "We're all Socialists now," the BBC and ITV have obviously decided that we're all multi-racialists, feminists and bisexuals now. Some things never really change; in his famous cave metaphor over two thousand years ago, Plato referred to people besotted with shadows on the wall while reluctant to emerge into the glare of reality outside.

What is becoming clearer by the day is that a radical overhaul of the mass media is a necessary part of any nationalist manifesto. Far from endangering basic freedoms, this will liberate people from a self-serving and tendentious media establishment with renegade politics and decadent values. To conclude, you will not improve your perception and understanding of the real world by switching programmes, only by changing the political régime.



Viewers are fed a constant diet of race-mixing, as in this scene from *EastEnders*. As everyone familiar with *East London* knows, the scene is totally untypical of real life there.

Read *Spearhead* on the Internet!

You can obtain the best articles and news items from *Spearhead* by visiting the *Spearhead* website at:-

www.spearhead-uk.com

Listen to nationalist radio!

Send International Reply Coupon for broadcast details to:-

NATIONAL VANGUARD BOOKS, Box 330, Hillsboro, WV 24946, U.S.A.

Internet: www.natvan.com & www.natall.com

So what really happened?

DURING the past few weeks, I've had the chance to read through some old articles from *Spearhead*, stretching back over a thirty-year period. The most striking factor which linked the various essays was how absolutely accurate and – even if it sounds overblown – prophetic most of them were. Obviously, with the passage of time, a few topics and controversies seem less relevant than they once did. But, overall, the content has held up very well.

To take just one significant example out of many, in 1996, well before the *Times* or *Telegraph* caught up, Ellen Strachan forecast a New World Order war against the Islamic nations.

It is always nice to maintain old traditions of veracity and honesty, and this what I propose to do this month, by revising an opinion I previously held. This was that the September 11th attacks were the ultimate responsibility of Al Qaeda, a previously fairly obscure terror group.

Now, we are portentously informed by the spokesmen of the controlled media that: "Just over two years ago the world changed forever." Apparently sensible people believe that Al Qaeda is the biggest threat of all to the continued maintenance of civilisation. Seeing beyond the superficialities, abundant evidence exists that – to use the terminology of General Sir Frank Kitson – Al Qaeda is no more than a 'pseudo-gang', initially sponsored by the CIA for use against the Russian occupiers of Afghanistan. While its foot soldiers may well be fanatical or idealistic Muslims, the overall direction rests elsewhere.

WHO GAINS?

In assigning responsibility for any deed, large or small, it's always best to use the ancient Roman principle of *cui bono*? Who gains? Admittedly, an attack of this nature might have appeal for some militant Muslims who could there- by feel that they were striking back in revenge against the bloody occupation of Palestine and against Iraqi sanctions. But would any of them be foolish enough to try such a thing as the 9/11 attacks, knowing they'd bring the wrath of the American super-power against their own people?

In the first place, we should note that the timing of the 9/11 attacks was extremely fortuitous for 'certain interests', coming so soon after the Durban Conference which had roundly condemned Zionism.

Precursors of this scenario are not by

As world attention focuses on the Madrid bombings, IAN BUCKLEY reminds us that we must never rely on mainstream politicians' or journalists' explanations of terrorist acts. Almost always, there are other causes and other culprits.

11th September 2001: One of the 'Twin Towers' in New York City is seen ablaze. The assumption that Al Qaida was responsible is contradicted by many facts. The big question is: who gains?



any means lacking in American history. Just over a century ago, incidentally when the Anglo-German (or WASP) component was completely dominant in the US, war with Spain was ignited by the sinking of an obsolete battleship, the *USS Maine*. Most now accept that the *Maine* was sunk by the Americans themselves, in order to provoke an easy war against a weak opponent.

In 1962 the CIA plotted terrorist attacks on US citizens in Operation Northwoods¹. They considered the possibility of launching terrorist attacks on American citizens in order to blame them on the Cubans, so creating a wave of national indignation. The plan, which involved killing US soldiers, sinking ships or shooting down planes, was vetoed by President Kennedy.

By the way, it should be remembered that the 9/11 attacks were not the only alleged hostile actions attributed to Arabs or Muslims which permitted the 'neo-cons' to pursue their unlimited war agenda. There was also the matter of the anthrax mailings to American politicians and media figures. Here, the notorious pathogen was accompanied by notes exclaiming 'Death to Israel', 'Death to America' and 'Allah is great'.

Though the campaign claimed half a

dozen lives, readers will no doubt be scratching their heads and wondering why hardly anyone now mentions this particular outrage. Bush and Blair never sentimentally invoke these poor forgotten victims, do they? Indeed, the whole anthrax affair, which terrified both America and this country – with officials sending in men in contamination outfits to deal with burst consignments of flour – has become a non-event. How quickly we forget!

But there is a reason for all the embarrassed silence. The FBI traced the anthrax used to a specific 'weaponised' variant and found it had originated from the US Army research base at Fort Detrick, Maryland. A chief suspect has been identified, but the person concerned (certainly not an Arab) will not be prosecuted.

ISRAELIS ARRESTED

But even less publicity was given to the arrest of two Israelis, one a former Colonel in the IDF, who were caught inside the Mexican Congress in possession of dynamite, detonators and hand grenades. This happened just a month after the Twin Towers attack, and one must suspect that the intent was to perpetrate another 'spectacular' which

could be blamed on Al Qaeda. Those wise in the ways of the world will not be surprised to learn that the two errant Israelis were quietly sent back home after frantic high-level diplomatic activity.

CHICANERY AND FALSEHOOD

But this is small beer compared to the chicanery and falsehood surrounding the September 11th attacks themselves. Now movement in airline stock options before this date clearly indicated that someone had foreknowledge of the attacks, and used that knowledge to make a great deal of money. At least one of these option trades was done by the A.B. Brown investment bank, on whose board is the Executive Director of the CIA, A.B. Krongard.

Then again, we are supposed to suspend credulity and imagine that four out-of-control airliners could enter some of the most tightly controlled and heavily defended airspace in the world without being intercepted by fighter jets from nearby bases.

And why have we never been told what happened to the 'black boxes' and voice-recorders from the doomed flight? Are we to assume that they were incinerated, when by contrast an alleged hijacker's passport dropped unscathed from the sky? Why has no one been permitted to access the relevant air traffic control records?

There is also the mysterious fate of WTC 7, a solidly built 44-storey steel tower, which completely collapsed after being hit by 'flying debris', so allegedly starting some 'small fires'. From an aerial photograph, the site of WTC 7 looks like the result of an expert demolition job with explosives, a fate which may well have also befallen the Twin Towers. (See the article on the subject by J. McMichael entitled 'Muslims Suspend Laws of Physics'.²)

As the World Trade Centre towers fell, five Israeli nationals were arrested after a joyful celebration on top of a New Jersey roof. As with the intruders in the Mexican Congress a month later, they were surreptitiously sent home. Rumours of a large Israeli spy ring were scotched by the authorities. It seems likely, too, that many of the alleged hijackers on board the planes were victims of identity fraud. Who they really were may never be known.

TRAIL OF CONFLICT

And this farrago of deceit and deception, which suggests the distinct possibility of an 'inside job', has set off a trail of conflict across the world. The US has just set aside around \$30 million in order to prepare for a reinstatement of the Draft sometime after the next presiden-

tial election. Egalitarians and feminists will be pleased – or maybe not – to learn that this time conscription will extend to young women, and college education will provide no deferment whatever! All this in aid of the unending war desired by the likes of Wolfowitz, Perle and Frum, which has among its aims the destruction of 'terrorist camps' and 'terror-funding centres' worldwide. In terms of practical politics, one would have thought that the latter proposal was about as sane and sensible as sending in the RAF to bomb the Irish-American bars of Boston or Chicago.

Suspicion of something being amiss with the official story must also be strengthened by the blithe and insouciant attitude of the members of the US Administration. As Ellen Mariani, the widow of one victim, wrote in an open letter to the President:-

"On the morning of the attack, you and members of your staff were fully aware of the unfolding events, yet you chose to continue on to the Emma E. Booker Elementary School to proceed with a scheduled event and 'photo-op'. While our nation was under attack you did not appear to blink an eye or shed a tear. You continued on as if everything was 'business as usual'."

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle once put the following words into the mouth of Sherlock Holmes: "Once you have eliminated the impossible, that which remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

HIGH TREASON

Following Conan Doyle's dictum, I suggest that this is the case with the September 11th attacks, and that what we are dealing with here is *high treason*, even if none dare call it treason. The most probable conclusion is that elements within the Bush administration conspired with the intelligence service of a foreign power, probably Mossad. A faintly possible, though less likely, scenario is that some Arab group did pull off the attack, but following the example of Pearl Harbour the US Government or intelligence services knew of the impending operation but did nothing to stop it.

This line of reasoning may be exten-



Madrid: rescuers pick bodies out of the wreckage. Is this atrocity all it seems?

ded to the Madrid railway bombs of the 11th March which killed (so far) 200 people packed into rush-hour trains. Again we must ask: who profits from these wanton bombings, denied by Basque separatists ETA and then unconvincedly attributed to a previously unknown Arab grouplet?

Could any such organisation really pull off such a precision military-style attack, which involved ten bombs exploding at measured intervals? Could it all really be done on orders remotely delivered from a cave in Waziristan? In whose interest is it to prop up the flagging (more like non-existent) support for the 'war without end' envisaged by the neo-cons of Washington? Instead of mass protests against that war, there have been millions demonstrating in favour of the Bush line! As also happened a few years ago in Kenya, an Israeli forensic team have offered their assistance to the Spanish authorities!

Though some may regard these questions as impertinent, in the real world they must be asked. The now voted-out Spanish Prime Minister Aznar said that no avenue whatever would be left unexplored in hunting for the bombers. Let us hope that is so, that *true* facts are established, and that we are not dragged into war against more Arab states – to borrow a phrase from Victor Ostrovsky – by way of deception.

¹ See:-
<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/doc1.pdf>>

² See:-
<http://www.serendipity.li/wot/msip_i.htm>

RACIAL STRIFE IN AUSTRALIA

The following is an edited version of a longer report sent to Spearhead by our Australian correspondent Nigel Jackson. Much of the content will be familiar to UK readers.

A NINE-HOUR race riot in the inner Sydney suburb of Redfern on 15th and 16th February shocked Australians and was widely publicized around the world. A mob of over two hundred people, predominantly young Aboriginals, torched the entrance to the local railway station and a few nearby cars, hurled petrol bombs, fireworks, pieces of houses, paving stones and bricks, and rushed police lines with burning wheelie bins. Confronting them was a force of two hundred police, backed by the police air wing and fire fighters with fire hoses. High-power lights were used to confuse rioters. Two police advances were turned back. Forty police were injured and eight of these hospitalised, one of them having been knocked unconscious by a flying brick. Five people were arrested. The consequent property damage bill has been estimated at over a million dollars.

The full impact of the story broke in the Melbourne print media on 17th February. It appeared that the riot might have been sparked off by the tragic death of a seventeen year-old Aboriginal boy, Thomas Hickey, who on the 14th February had been impaled on a fence paling through the neck after a pushbike accident. Sources sympathetic to the rioters claimed that the freak injury had occurred after a police car had chased the youth.

Police denied these claims and within days had published a video recording of a brutal bag-snatching crime inflicted on a woman outside Redfern railway station. The woman had been dragged across a road five hours before Hickey's accident. Police stated that they had had four cars cruising the area at the time Hickey was seen fleeing at great speed on his bicycle, but that they were looking for the bag-snatcher.

On the other hand, other observers argued that Hickey's death had been used as a pretext by those with their own political agendas or appetites for violence. New South Wales Premier Bob Carr immediately blamed ringleaders "hell-bent on inciting violence" in the simmering trouble spot. Fairly sophisticated posters insulting the police as 'child murderers' had appeared in many places in the hours before the riot. Mr. Carr said that there had been three attempts at independent mediation before the riot broke out.

The NSW Government rapidly ann-

ounced that three inquiries had been charged with the task of finding out what had caused the riot and what the police involvement had been. Results of these inquiries – by the state

NIGEL JACKSON reports and comments on the recent riot in Redfern, Sydney

coroner, by the police critical incident team and by the state ombudsman – have not been published as this article is being written on the 9th March.

The background

Before considering further details, I will provide *Spearhead* readers with the context of the riot.

The 2001 national census showed that the under-privileged suburb of Redfern, in South Sydney and close to the central business district, had a population of 15,840,

of Aboriginal culture." The suburb had the first Aboriginal legal and medical services in Australia. In December 1972 (just after the election of the Whitlam ALP government after twenty-three years of Liberal-National coalition control) squatters moved into empty terrace houses and the AHC was formed. Charged with managing 'The Block', as it has come to be called, the AHC has been a charity providing affordable housing for Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders.

The Block, where the riot occurred, is a small section of Redfern bounded by Caroline, Vine, Louis and Eveleigh Streets. This area was purchased with a \$530,000 grant from the Whitlam government (whose period of office lasted until November 1975 and the famous dismissal by the Governor-General, Sir John Kerr) to be an inner-city community for indigenous Australians.

The South Sydney Council, together with ALP minister Tom Uren, helped pioneer The Block as a seemingly noble and idealistic, self-contained, cheap enclave in which Aboriginals could help each other cope with urban life. As a result, the Aboriginal population in Redfern tripled between



REDFERN

Police in riot gear under attack by mob

four per cent of whom were Aboriginal. Median weekly income was \$322 and median weekly rent \$88. 47 per cent of the population lived in government housing.

During the previous thirty years, Redfern had become what the project officer of the Aboriginal Housing Company, Peter Valilis, called (after the riot) "the epicentre

1976 and 1981.

Unfortunately The Block has never delivered on its promise. It came to be a site of despair resembling a Third World slum. Thus in the past three decades Redfern has spawned agitation, national protests, political rallies and sporadic rioting and confrontations with police. In 1995 rioting led to a

massive damage bill and a long police casualty list. Since 1996 there have been sixteen major clashes between police and residents, the most serious incidents occurring (before the latest riot) in January 1997, January 1998, June 2001 and May 2003.

Between 1991 and 1997 The Block was a no-go area for police. During the past nine years officers have been attacked while trying to arrest suspects, forced to flee their cars, spat upon and assaulted. A TV crew and firefighters have been attacked. Bus drivers, because of stone-throwing, have refused to drive through Redfern; and taxi-drivers often refuse to enter the suburb. There is graffiti throughout The Block and a kindergarten ruined by vandalism.

Many Aboriginal residents live in poverty, with too many of them taking refuge in drugs and alcohol. Most NSW trains go through Redfern, which has helped the suburb become a magnet for drug dealers and addicts as well as other trouble-makers. Even young children are caught up in the vicious world of drugs. The current unemployment rate among Redfern Aboriginals is said to be 33 per cent; and there are high rates of hepatitis, HIV and respiratory illnesses. High birthrates are alleged to be causing a dramatic increase in the proportion of young indigenous people.

The suburb that has now become a focal point of an Aboriginal activism that at times has evinced a new racism – black racism.

There are eighty or so welfare and aid groups operating in Redfern, demonstrating a largely white concern by pouring in huge sums of money. Meanwhile, the NSW Government has been endeavouring to redevelop The Block; and it is said that sixty-eight of the original ninety-one dwellings have been demolished. It has also been claimed that a proposed sixty-two new units in The Block have not been completed due to starvation of government funds.

A Political issue

Aboriginal affairs are currently a very big issue in Australia. An enormous controversy has been raging over the so-called 'history wars', with two schools of thought differing bitterly over the degree to which European settlement is to be condemned for the plight of Aboriginals. Lesser controversies have broken out over disputes as to whether or not national museums faithfully and fairly represent Australian history to the current generation. Lurking in the background are other disagreements about Aboriginal land rights and other matters. All in all, Aboriginal issues have the power to make or break governments at election time; and the electorate itself is bitterly divided on how to cope with the various problems.

Thus it was not surprising to find Prime Minister John Howard eventually making a

statement, as he struggles to win a fourth election against the odds towards the end of the year. Howard was quoted in *The Age* on the 27th February as saying that the riot was partly the result of treating the indigenous community differently to the rest of Australia. He defended the police and explained that a combination of factors were involved including a total breakdown in family authority within Aboriginal communities. He saw the solution as very much lying "in treating everybody equally and as part of the mainstream."

Australia's treatment of its Aborigines is also a matter with international ramifications, so it was not surprising to find *The Australian* on the 21st-22nd February quoting newspapers in Singapore, South Africa and Britain adversely criticising our nation. Even the *Glasgow Herald* weighed in with the assertion that "the riot was symptomatic of a country unable to come to terms with its shameful past or face up to the present yawning gulf between black and white society." My own recommendation to the *Herald* is that it concentrate on helping Britain solve its racial difficulties first, before presuming to lecture us.

Conclusion

One of the first areas of government to which ALP Prime Minister Gough Whitlam turned his attention in 1972 and 1973 was Aboriginal affairs, over which he placed one Gordon Bryant as minister in charge. A dramatic redefinition of 'Aboriginality' was

With the author's article last month dealing with the Pauline Hanson story a photograph of Aboriginals was shown bearing a caption stating that they had contributed nothing to the development of Australia. The author wishes it to be known that this does not reflect his own opinions. We apologise to Mr. Jackson for any embarrassment that might have been caused him as a result of the caption.

then decreed, which virtually amounted to permission to anyone who could prove some Aboriginal ancestry to denote himself or herself as an Aboriginal. Thus the number of 'Aboriginals' in Australia was greatly increased in a rapid manner and (for those who wanted one) there was much more chance of creating an 'Aboriginal problem'. Of course, there were juicy financial inducements to individuals to claim Aboriginality. It is interesting to note that the purchase of The Block occurred at this time. It is also interesting to note that none of the items in

the three Melbourne papers which I studied to prepare this article made any mention of the fact that most of the Redfern Aboriginals and most of the rioters were in fact half-castes.

A distinction needs to be drawn between these more or less Europeanized Aboriginals and the few true-bloods who endeavour to maintain genuine, traditional Aboriginal culture in a few remote areas of the continent. These true-bloods have no interest whatever in the sort of shabby Marxist or socialist revolution crudely promoted in Redfern and other urban settings.

It can be argued that the coming of the Europeans was a great tragedy for the Aboriginals, since it effectively brought to an end their possession of the continent and led to wholesale loss of their tribal traditions and culture, as well as much suffering from disease and other factors. Nevertheless, it happened; and the brute fact remains that **the Aboriginals failed to defend the continent against invaders.** Certain High Court decisions in the closing decades of the last century notwithstanding, Aboriginals cannot with justification now claim a right to re-take part or all of the continent. Federal and state governments must be rock-solid firm in insisting on this principle and in rejecting any attempt of outside bodies, the UNO or any other, to alter the *status quo*. Whether Australia as a nation will show the requisite strength in this matter remains to be seen.

Within this perspective it is plain that the federal and state governments have a primary duty to ensure law and order – in Redfern just like anywhere else. Only after that law and order have been clearly instituted and firmly maintained, does it become reasonable to ask governments, police and citizens generally to honour a duty of care to the descendants and part-descendants of the Aborigines.

It seems clear that foolish modes of multi-culturalism are not likely to be helpful, and that a greater national effort to crack down on drug-trafficking is essential. Also, since it has become very obvious again in a most public way that **race does matter**, the trend of insulting opponents in racial controversies as 'racists' is one which needs to be reversed. The deployment of that term during the last thirty or so years has often been truly disgraceful.

On past performance, the Liberal-National coalition cannot be trusted to take the strong and principled stand necessary to resolve Aboriginal controversies wisely. That is one of the most pressing reasons why the formation of an effective nationalist movement in Australia remains urgent.

Nigel Jackson is a Melbourne poet, writer and teacher.

Final costs of the Tyndall 'expulsion'

£12,000 DOWN THE DRAIN!

At the Royal Courts of Justice in London on the 23rd February, a judge heard the application for costs incurred in the action taken by John Tyndall against Nick Griffin and Others for reinstatement to BNP membership following his (Tyndall's) expulsion from the party last August. As readers will have been informed, Mr. Griffin made the decision to annul the expulsion and reinstate Mr. Tyndall on legal advice following strong representations made by Mr. Tyndall and his solicitors. The alternative to this was for the case to go to a court of law, with very large costs likely to be incurred by the Griffin camp (meaning the BNP). Mr. Tyndall offered an out-of-court settlement as an alternative to this and Mr. Griffin, on legal advice, decided that he had no alternative but to climb down and agree to the reinstatement.

In our last report on the case, printed in the December 2003 issue, we said that costs had been awarded against Griffin & Ors. amounting to £3,241.50. This granting of costs was made by a judge upon submission of a written application by Mr. Tyndall's solicitors. A condition of this kind of judgement is that the party against which costs are awarded has the right to be granted a hearing in court at which the judgement can be challenged. Mr. Griffin and his associates applied for this and the hearing took place as stated above.

The argument put forward by council acting for Griffin & Ors. was that Mr. Griffin had not been given adequate notice that an application for judicial review of the case would be presented to court not later than the 3rd November if agreement to reinstatement of Mr. Tyndall had not in the meantime been given. The significance of this date was that it was exactly three months from the date of the expulsion, which had been made on the 3rd August. The law requires that applications for judicial review of such expulsions from political parties and any other unincorporated associations must be made within three months of the decision to expel. Had the application been made any later than November 3rd, it might have been granted under certain circumstances but there was no certainty of this; it

would be a matter of a judge's discretion. The risk that a judge might have exercised his or her discretion *not* to grant the application on grounds that it was 'out of time' could not be taken; hence the imperative of ensuring that the application was submitted at court not later than November 3rd.

CONSTITUTIONAL APPEAL

On September 29th Mr. Tyndall wrote a letter to Mr. Griffin in which he formally exercised his right of appeal against the expulsion in accordance with Section 6(10) of the BNP constitution. The letter set out the grounds for appeal in full detail. Mr. Tyndall never expected the appeal to be upheld but his policy was to ensure that if the matter later had to go to court he would be able to have the appeal on record and claim that he had exhausted all internal means of getting satisfaction over the case beforehand. It is not normal for a court to consider such an appeal in any other circumstances.

Mr. Tyndall's solicitor then sent his own letter to Mr. Griffin putting the same case against expulsion but in his own words. This letter was posted on the 8th October.

Both letters made it abundantly clear that if an out-of-court agreement for reinstatement could not be reached an application for judicial review of the case would be made.

We now come forward to Friday, the 31st October, the last working day before the day of deadline for the putting in of the application. By this time Mr. Griffin had made no reply either to Mr. Tyndall's letter of the 29th September or to his solicitor's letter of the 8th October. In other words, he had had a full month and two days to respond to Mr. Tyndall's letter and three weeks and two days to respond to the solicitor's letter but had failed to do so in either case.

The application was made to the court in the afternoon of the 31st October. After it had been granted, the court contacted Mr. Griffin in a letter dated the 4th November informing him of this, as is standard procedure. Mr. Griffin then wrote to both Mr. Tyndall and his solicitor in letters both dated the 5th November informing them of



SCENE OF THE RULING
The case for costs was heard in the Royal Courts of Justice in London (above). Justice Moses presided.

the rescinding of the expulsion and of Mr. Tyndall's reinstatement.

In a subsequent letter to the solicitor dated the 10th November Mr. Griffin claimed that his two letters of the 5th November had "crossed in the post" with the letter sent to him on the 4th November from the court informing him of the granting of the application.

The question must arise: did the letter from the court to Mr. Griffin sent on the 4th November in fact "cross in the post" as claimed, or did it arrive *before* Mr. Griffin's two letters of the 5th November, in which case these two letters of the 5th November almost certainly would have been written *after* and *in consequence* of the notification from the court?

UNNECESSARY DELAY

Since the latter cannot be proven, we must accept Mr. Griffin's claim that the letters did in fact cross in the post. In that case it can only be said that Mr. Griffin took an extraordinarily and unnecessarily long time to respond to the two letters from Mr. Tyndall and his solicitor calling for reinstatement: in the first case 37 days and in the second case 28 days.

To us, the application for Mr. Tyndall's costs was based on the

simple fact that Mr. Griffin had acknowledged defeat in the case, for this was the effect of his decision to reinstate – quite regardless of how he may see it or explain it. It therefore seemed a simple matter for Mr. Tyndall's costs to be assessed and then applied for. The assessment, as stated previously, was £3,241.50, and that was the figure named in the application.

We then heard from Mr. Griffin's solicitors saying that the application would be opposed on the grounds that he had been given no notification that the application for review of the expulsion would be entered at court not later than November 3rd.

Mr. Tyndall responded to this by citing the two letters of the 29th September and 8th October which both made it abundantly clear that such an application would be the next step if an out-of-court settlement resulting in reinstatement was not agreed to. In neither his letter nor that of his solicitor was a precise deadline date mentioned. However, the contention of the Tyndall party was that in all matters of law when a person finds himself the defendant in an action the onus is on him to ascertain what he has to do in his defence and when he has to do it; it is not the job of the plaintiffs to hold his hand and guide him in such matters. It would have been a perfectly simple matter for Mr. Griffin to contact his own legal advisers and ascertain from them any time limits involved in his response to the two letters calling for reinstatement. The latter should then have advised him that if Mr. Tyndall's application for judicial review was to be ensured acceptance by the court it would have to be in by the 3rd November at the very latest. That would mean that if he (Griffin) were to avoid the taking of the case to court his response agreeing to a settlement would have to be communicated to Mr. Tyndall and his solicitor so that they would receive it before that time.

It would seem that this legal advice was neither sought nor given.

THE BLAME

This being the case, Mr. Griffin had only himself to blame for the fact that the application was entered at the court before his letter indicating willingness to a settlement was received. On these grounds, the Tyndall party pleaded that the costs incurred up to that stage should be granted.

The judge hearing the opposition to the costs award on the 23rd February

was Mr. Justice Moses. He reprimanded Mr. Griffin strongly for his failure to reply in time to the two letters of the 29th September and 8th October, saying that this failure was compounded by the fact that not even the courtesy of an acknowledgement of either letter was given. Just such an acknowledgement, containing a message that the matter would be dealt with as soon as possible, could have mitigated things. But not even this was forthcoming – just silence.

At this stage it seemed as if the judge was going to look favourably on the application for costs, and thus uphold the previous award of same. However, he then indicated some sympathy with the plea by Mr. Griffin's counsel that a precise deadline date for the application for judicial review had not been given, and that this provided some excuse for Mr. Griffin's failure to reply in time to the letters calling for reinstatement. Balancing these two conflicting arguments, he then ended by ruling that each party to the dispute pay its own costs, in other words that Mr. Tyndall's application for his costs, previously granted, be denied.

Mr. Tyndall's solicitor has acknowledged some omission in his failure to name a deadline date in his letter of the 8th October to Mr. Griffin. It is our considered opinion, however, that this omission was one of very small detail and that Mr. Griffin should anyway have known of such a deadline by way of simple enquiry. His failure to acknowledge in good time the two letters of the 29th September and 8th October was inexcusable, and this should have made it very clear that Mr. Tyndall's application for costs was a valid and just one. His Lordship, however, ruled otherwise. Possibly, he decided that in a case involving two factions of the BNP his only resort was to take neither side!

The upshot of all this is that Mr. Tyndall will be required to pay costs amounting to the sum of £6,040, this including further solicitor's costs incurred subsequent to the original application and the costs of hiring counsel to represent Mr. Tyndall in court on the 23rd February, agreed to on advice from his solicitor.

As stated in our report in December, the sum of £2,579.05 was received in contributions from supporters to a legal fund set up to fight this case. This means that a further sum of £3,460.95 towards the costs must be found. It is intended that this sum will be met from a special fund in Mr.

Tyndall's custody dating from a legacy from a deceased supporter in 1991. This is highly regrettable because it was hoped that no drawings from this fund for this case would be necessary.

Our understanding is that the costs incurred by the Griffin party in fighting the case, which they in turn will have to meet, will amount, again, to close to £6,000 – which means, in effect, that that sum of money will have to come out of the funds of the BNP.

THE COST TO THE CAUSE

So, all in all, the result of this vindictive and utterly senseless attempt to expel John Tyndall from the party which he and others founded 22 years ago is that, one way or the other, the nationalist cause is financially the poorer to a figure probably exceeding £12,000.

Approximately half of this, we presume, will have to come from out of the funds of the BNP itself rather than from out of Mr. Griffin's own pocket; more than a quarter will have to come from the special fund in Mr. Tyndall's custody which was intended to be used to benefit the same cause; and a further portion will have come from the pockets of loyal patriotic individuals who have supported Mr. Tyndall's legal action and who otherwise might have been able to contribute the money for other purposes.

It will be recalled by some that there was a similar wastage back in 2000, when a sum of £10,000 had to be taken from party funds to pay compensation to the Metropolitan Police for a foolishly conceived leaflet, claimed by the police to be defamatory. This was quite apart from additional costs for legal services in the case, which are not known.

We sincerely hope that Mr. Griffin and his supporters are pleased with this achievement.

THE CANDLELIGHT PRESS (INTERNATIONAL)

A wonderful new book service for nationalists. Agents for 'The Historical Reprint Series' and 'Heroes of the White Race' in addition to many in-house productions.



Full listings free on request from
G.H. Smith
60 St. Peters Grove,
Canterbury
Kent CT1 2DJ

Is Britain under Zionist control?

ALISTAIR FENNER
tackles a
'sensitive'
subject

"In an age of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act."

George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

I AM confident that no one will disagree with me when I state that most leaders in the government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are the lapdogs of the rulers of the US – and that, whatever they say or do, 'our' leaders follow the latter like rats did the pied piper, regardless of whether it is in our national interests or not.

Knowing this, we must look into who truly has control over the US Government, who mans the oligarchy of power within the United States, who are those who have the power to say what's what and what our next move will be.

I am also confident that no one will disagree when I say that this 'war on terror' – including the war on Iraq – has been against our national interests: a war into which we had no reason to go headlong and one that has given so much fuel to the hate against our nation in the Middle Eastern World (those who understand that our foreign policy is governed by our unconditional subservience to the United States and support of Israel). This is not to mention the outright lies about 'weapons of mass destruction', the claims that Saddam Hussein was a 'direct threat' to our nation, and that those who waged war on America and the Western World by crashing two planes into the World Trade Centre did so because they "hated our freedom."

It was because of the pro-Israel oligarchy within the US Government and the total Jewish control of the news and entertainment media in America – a more powerful weapon than bombs and missiles, and one that can change the minds of millions and manipulate the world – that those planes struck.

This is far from an 'anti-Semitic' statement by some wild-eyed 'racist'. It is, rather, a fact easily confirmed by research. I hope this short essay will encourage some to do a little more research and to make decisions for themselves on these issues.

In 1998, on the American ABC network, Osama Bin Laden gave his views very clearly on why he opposed America. Here are some excerpts:-

"I say to them that they (the Americans) have put themselves at the mercy of a disloyal government, and this is most evident in Clinton's administration. We believe that it represents Israel inside America. Take the sensitive ministries such as the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defence and the CIA, you will find that the Jews have the upper hand in them. They make use of America to further their plans for the world... For over half a century, Muslims in Palestine have been slaughtered and assaulted (by the Israelis) and robbed of their honour and of their property. Their houses have been blasted, their crops destroyed."

So I ask: Is 'anti-Semitism' never a result of Jewish behaviour?

BRITAIN POTENTIAL TERRORIST TARGET

Due to the United Kingdom's unconditional support of the US Government – and the latter's and our unconditional support of Israel -- we are the country which, next to the US, is most likely to be attacked by terrorists. We have let Jewish supremacists take control of Britain, its leaders and its policies, which are ultimately in total opposition to our national interests.

American National Alliance spokesman Kevin Alfred Strom, speaking on the *American Dissident Voices* broadcast on the 6th

September 2003, said: "Next to the United States, Britain is probably the country most firmly under the Jewish thumb."

Do you start to feel uneasy when I say that we are controlled by a cabal of Jewish Supremacists? Then please give your attention to a statement made by President Ariel Sharon when speaking to Shimon Peres on the *Kol Yisrael* radio station October 3, 2001:-

"Every time we do something you tell me America will do this and will do that... I want to tell you something very clear. Don't worry about American pressure on Israel. We the Jewish people control America, and the Americans know it."

This clearly confirms what I and many others have been saying. And Sharon is not the only source. In 2003, US Rep. James Moran made the this daring statement:-

"If it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq we would not be doing this. The leaders of the Jewish community are influential enough that they could change the direction of where this is going, and I think they should."



TAM DALYELL

Acknowledged Jewish influence in Britain and the US

Later, Mr. Moran fell on his knees and apologised – but the facts remain the same. On this side of the ocean, long-time MP Tam Dalyell, in an interview with *Vanity Fair* magazine last May, referred to a Jewish 'cabal'. Later, defending this on Radio Four's *World at One* programme, he said:-

"The cabal that I referred to was in the US... There is far too much Jewish influence in the United States."

And he went on to say of one body:-

"That is the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs. I was thinking of [Paul] Wolfowitz, Deputy Defence Minister [Richard] Perle, [John] Bolton, Assistant Secretary of State, [Douglas] Feith, [Ken] Adelman, [Elliot] Abrams and [Ari] Fleischer, [Mr Bush's press secretary.] Those people drive this policy."

Dalyell said that the Government of the US is "being unduly influenced by a cabal of Jewish advisers." He also confirmed Jewish influence in Britain, thus:-

"I am worried about my country being led up the garden path on a

Likudnik [Ariel] Sharon agenda... Straw, Mandelson & Co. are leading a tremendous drive to sort out the Middle East."

Michael Lord Levy, Tony Blair's chief fund-raiser and personal envoy to the Middle East, also Jewish, received attention from Dalyell as well:-

"I believe his influence has been very important on the Prime Minister and has led to what I see as this awful war and the sack of Baghdad."

Dalyell later went on to say that he had "picked out one person [in Britain] about whom I am extremely concerned, and I have to be blunt about it. That is Lord Levy." Finally, he rightly asserted that: "The British people have been deceived."

The United Kingdom is being turned into a Third World slum by uncontrolled non-white immigration. It is being plagued by dramatic increases in criminal violence, racial tension, AIDS and cultural discord since the multi-racialist experiment began here, along with a growing anti-white bias in the news and entertainment media. These policies are being financed and led, in large part, by Jewish supremacists through our Government and media.

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

One example among many of outright Jewish admittance of their control was in the August 1996 issue of *Moment* magazine, which had as its headline 'Jews run Hollywood – so what?' Michael Medved, a well-known Jewish film critic, wrote this piece, in which he stated:-

"It makes no sense at all to try to deny the reality of Jewish power and predominance in popular culture. Any list of the most influential production executives at each of the major movie studios will produce a heavy majority of recognisably Jewish names."

I will leave you now with one last quote, a fitting one and one to which I certainly subscribe:-


"Whether or not One World is the secret final objective of Zionism, World Jewry is the most powerful single force on earth, and it follows that all the major policies which have been ruthlessly pursued through the last several decades must have had the stamp of Jewish approval. Indeed, common sense applied to such facts as have come to light must lead to the conclusion that the policies, directed against the most cherished Gentile values, were incubated by adroit Jewish brains and fulfilled, or carried to the verge of fulfilment, by the dynamism of the Jewish spirit. At the same time, so many Gentiles are associated with the conspiracy, both directly and through the

formation of fronts, there are so many Gentile agents and agencies, and so many Gentile governments which have acquiesced in the conspiracy by falling into line with policies inimical to their own national interests, that it would be ludicrous to offload onto Jewish shoulders responsibility for the destruction, or near destruction, of Christendom and the Western World. Nevertheless, it would be equally ludicrous to deny the Jewish part, especially where it is admitted...

"Had we of the

Gentile nations stood firm in defence of our own traditions and values, instead of cravenly capitulating, the Jews would have remained what they ought to be – a small sect living contentedly and at peace with their neighbours, exercising neither national nor international power and entertaining no inordinate ambitions. That, as I wrote at the outset, is how most of them actually do live. That a minority of them has been able to mount such a stupendous drive for world power is not their fault but ours alone, and it is we who must put things right – or perish. The way to put things right is not to engage in 'hate campaigns' (which in any event more often than not play into Jewish hands) but to make a determined stand for our own legitimate and distinctive interests."

Those were the words of A.K. Chesterton in *The New Unhappy Lords*. They provide a good point at which to rest my case.



"JEWS RUN HOLLYWOOD — SO WHAT?"
With these words Michael Medved (above) has acknowledged the control of his people over the movie industry in the United States. British TV and cinema are dominated by Hollywood products.

This seems to be where we came in. When last year it was announced triumphantly in the British National Party paper *The Voice of Freedom* that a council election candidate in Cumbria had been chosen who 'loved' his black son-in-law, there were widespread murmurs of discontent within the party. Later the candidate withdrew, and in a subsequent bulletin BNP chairman Nick Griffin acknowledged that the thing had been a mistake.

Now a great deal of disquiet has arisen in the BNP following the announcement that the party has adopted a Jewish candidate to contest a district council election in Epping Forest (Essex). The candidate is Mrs. Pat Richardson (58). Her candidature was immediately greeted with incredulous opposition in the Jewish community, and an article, by one Justin Cohen, condemning her decision to stand was published in the *London Jewish News* of the 11th March. In the article Labour Friends of Israel spokesman David Mencer was quoted as describing Mrs. Richardson's adoption by the BNP as "a sick stunt." But, according to the article, the BNP's organiser in nearby Redbridge, Jason Douglas, was quoted as

A STUNT TOO FAR

Spearhead's view on the Jewish candidate controversy

saying: "She happens to be Jewish, but so what?"

There will be some in the party who will describe this latest move as 'clever'. We do not think it is in the least bit clever. We have nothing against Mrs. Richardson personally. We are not acquainted with her, and for all we know she may be an admirable lady. We believe, however, that her adoption by the party as a candidate will not win it a single extra vote, least of all among the Jewish community, while it will dismay and demoralise a great many of the party faithful – as indeed we know has already happened. A political fact that has to be faced is that organised Jewry in Britain is implacably hostile to the BNP and dedicated to opposing it at every turn; and that reality is not going to be changed one iota by this latest move. Mrs. Richardson is not to be blamed for what organised Jewry may say or do, but she is linked inextricably with it, as every Jewish person is, in the eyes of British ethnic nationalists – just

as the latter, fairly or unfairly, are stigmatised by the Jewish community as 'anti-semites'. For the latter reason, it would be absurd for any British ethnic nationalist to stand for election to office in any Jewish organisation, and likewise it is absurd to choose a Jewish person to represent the BNP in any capacity whatsoever.

Because of her decision to stand for the BNP, Mrs. Richardson will undoubtedly come under immense pressure from her own community to withdraw; and it is possible that she may have done so by the time this issue comes out. We believe that it was entirely wrong to expose her to that pressure in what Mr. Mencer has termed – we are bound to acknowledge rightly – a 'stunt'. As in the case of the short-lived candidate with the black son-in-law, it is a stunt too far.

In case there are some people in the BNP who regard this as a 'last straw' and are considering resigning from the party as a result, we urge them strongly not to do so. Such a move would most certainly delight some of those who have backed the adoption of Mrs. Richardson, and could well have been the principal hope in their minds when they gave that backing.

ANTONY MILNE considers continued immigration into Britain to be...

MAD AND DANGEROUS

SO MUCH is now published in parts of the mainstream press about multi-culturalism, illegal immigration and 'health tourism' that writers in this journal can take a back seat for a while and let them all get on with it. For once, we don't have to cobble together the odd facts and figures previously released by a nervous and inhibited media; now the floodgates (both the migrants and the journalism about migrants) are open wide, with many writers even apologising for keeping the subject under wraps for so long!

Just a brief summary of the crazy situation so far: Britain, with a population approaching 60 million, is one of the most overcrowded countries in the world. It is also one of the very oldest ancestral nations, the very last place on earth that would benefit from a massive influx of people from *anywhere*.

Taking just England – as distinct from the United Kingdom as a whole, the country is twice as crowded as Germany, four times as crowded as France and about 12 times as crowded as the United States. Further, throughout the 1970s and 1980s tough Immigration Acts were passed precisely to limit the influx of foreign workers. In the early 1980s, let's recall, there was so much unemployment that the Thatcher Government was for a long time highly unpopular. Unemployment in Britain is still about one and a half million, though official figures, suitably laundered, claim far fewer.

So why are we now letting in millions of immigrants when we clearly don't need them? Because the people who used to run this country some 20 or more years ago are no longer around. Other weirdoes have taken their place.

The fact that the British and Irish, alone of the EU states, are willing to allow tens of millions of East Europeans the theoretical right to live and work here should tell us all we need to know about the sick-headed liberal élites who now run this country. Don't be fooled by any tinkering around the edges, by preventing the new arrivals from claiming benefits for two years. Other European countries will not even allow them to work for seven years! This fact alone will mean that those Gypsies banned from working in Europe will know that Britain, already the preferred target of their choice, is now their only hope. They will flood here in huge numbers, since 200,000 of every race under the sun are already pouring in every year.

More immigrants: business as usual

But being flooded out with Gypsies is business as usual, the only difference being the slightly lighter hue that the new lot will have compared with the existing lot. In any event, the EU Commission itself recently

admitted that

restrictions being put in place by the other EU countries would do little to reduce the expected migration to the West of some 3.8 million people over the next 25 years.

This appalling state of affairs, let us repeat, has come about because the wrong sort of people in charge of this country have had cultural power for too long, and have either allowed it to happen or have worked

VIOLENCE AND MAYHEM
This is a picture from one of the riots in northern towns in 2001. These disorders showed the multi-racial experiment in Britain to be a total disaster.



towards it. So let us not blame the Eurocrats all the time; they haven't stopped the Dutch declaring that they are chucking out 26,000 of their own unwanted illegals.

The media and their advertising side-kicks must take much of the can because they have dominated and controlled the subject for too long and disseminated blatantly false ideas about the sort of country Britain is, so that the politicians themselves now believe the lies they read in their own media. The recent subtle U-turns in the tabloid media are making life tough for the politicians: now they are getting confused about which parts of the media to believe – the liberal 'more the merrier' broadsheets or the more raucous 'benefit spongers' tabloids.

It is still the liberal establishment, and the propaganda sheets of that establishment, that alone and single-handedly have enlarged the sizeable minority who now believe that liberalism has a high moral purpose. We all know of course that this establishment is, on the contrary, highly anti-democratic, extremely élitist and inexorably leading this country towards disaster. Liberals are arrogant, loud-mouthed, intellectually muddled, hypocritical, ignorant, mad and *dangerous*.

These remarks are not made lightly. Most journalists are not intellectuals and have insufficient knowledge of world cultures and the history of nation-states to be able to discuss the subject of immigration uncontaminated with loads of ideological (and exclusively western) left-liberal baggage. **But it always seems to be they who do all the yapping and laying down the law about the subject.** Why don't the academics have a look-in for a change? Aren't they paid to analyse the condition of Britain today?

Political correctness has been seized upon by those who had been left disoriented by the collapse of both Christian belief and communism within one short decade. Into the vacuum it was possible for liberal-minded people to fill their ideas-starved little noddles with the compassionate and worthy credo of the New Élites, as well getting for themselves membership cards into quasi-political careers

in the media, NGOs, do-good campaigns and 'human rights' bodies – in other words, into those movements that have replaced the earlier CND and left-wing union set-ups to which their older siblings and friends used to belong (one wit has referred to these campaigners as 'politicians in drag').

Influence of lawyers

We must also not forget that the legal profession has attracted reform-minded liberals in a big way. Lawyers are growing in numbers and are politically very powerful, and they have promoted and prolonged immigration into Britain through their fanatical 'human rights' culture; and they are doing this by undermining one formerly inviolate liberal credo – that lawyers do not take on political powers or overrule political decisions; instead this is the one thing they do all the time with a vengeance.

Not only that, but liberals now champion a new kind of internationalism that is not merely abstract; it can easily be brought about by racial and cultural mixing. And it would be a revolution that, unlike that of communism, could not be reversed short of civil war or ethnic cleansing.

Multi-culturalism has been virtually unchallenged for still yet another reason: liberals now look favourably on capitalist greed, something that obviously the old Left never did. This is because capitalism and communism have one thing in common: an internationalism that denigrates borders and ethnic identities. The business class want cheap labour even if they have to commit people-trafficking crimes to get it; and the old socialists were in any event always sympathetic to the idea of defining nations as part of political empires that were classless

and raceless.

Don't forget that the history books were severely re-jigged in the old Soviet Union so that people could get used to this new way of thinking about a class- and race-free society. Similarly, British values have to be downgraded and history made irrelevant, as schools and universities seek to destroy national pride – because a national identity is considered to be 'racist' and 'imperialist'.

British history is today virtually non-existent in schools, so children are given no sense of our national story, and can't make sense of the society they inhabit. In addition, of course, if too many foreigners come into the country and cannot identify with its history, that history cannot even be taught. Thus the left-liberals go one up on the Soviets! This is something they welcome, of course, because they welcome nihilism. The country sooner or later begins to unravel because it has no past, and no common values or shared history.

Needless to say, some liberals – those who are not quite brain-dead – are now beginning to suspect the futility of what they are doing. The word 'diversity' (which is always enriching, remember!) stems from 'division'; or 'diverse' or 'unlikeness'.

But if you want complete equality then you can't want people to be *unlike* each other, and unlike each other in the most visible manner possible, as if they were tarred with the Mark of Cain. It is a bit barmy attempting to do away with class differences only to replace them with *racial* (i.e. nationality) differences, because, there is no guarantee, judging from history, that different nationalities want to live side by side with each other, no matter what

their common beliefs.

It is also uneasily dawning on the liberals that if a common ancestry is repudiated as a form of natural social solidarity, then something – a shared religion or ideology – must take its place. But liberalism is actively *hostile* to religion and ideology (its advocates don't seem to realise that liberalism is itself an ideology), preferring to let people do their own thing and believe their own beliefs (indeed, chucking different nationalities together virtually guarantees that people *won't* have common beliefs!).

Nonsense about 'Britishness'

True, there is now a desperate attempt to backtrack on this, but only by papering over cultural differences with half-baked politicised sentiments. For example, journalists like Sue MacGregor, who enthuse about the 'British oath of allegiance' (foolishly supported by Prince Charles), believe 'Britishness' to be about a shared set of cultural and political assumptions. But on closer scrutiny these turn out to be just a load of clichés about 'democracy', 'human rights', 'justice' and other waffly terms to which millions of other people in other countries would equally give lip-service. They are only words, after all; and in a crime-festering, ghetto-ridden dump like Britain is now becoming they ring pretty hollow.

The point is, however, that 'Britishness' in their eyes is never, ever about a common racial heritage, when that is about the only thing – given that we all believe in different ideas – that the Anglo-Celts definitely can all share.

In a recent BBC Radio 4 discussion about

the 'Britishness' or otherwise of ethnic minorities in Leicester – a major city in the Midlands of *England*, remember – not once were the words 'English', 'Welsh' or 'Scottish' used. The voluble ethnics in the audience (i.e. most of the audience) made damned sure that only the word 'British' was used and no other, since this word had more of a Sue MacGregor 'citizenship' ring to it.

The BBC is now the closest thing to totalitarian evil in this country. Reluctantly dragged into the British identity debate, its operatives go around the country, microphones in hand, asking what people think 'Britishness' means to them, **but they make absolutely damned sure in every single case that the statement: "I am English/Scottish/ Welsh because my forefathers were that" is never broadcast.**

In the end, of course, nothing can take the place of racial solidarity except cultural anarchy. The fact that this seems to be actually preferable is proof of my accusation that most left-liberals are indeed mad and dangerous. Even if they don't want anarchy, they will sooner or later get it. Furthermore, when they are long dead and buried, later generations will know whom to blame for it. They certainly won't be blaming the BNP!

Bear one thing in mind. If there is no national loyalty, then law and order breaks down because no one recognises the legitimacy of the legal process that binds us all together as one nation. No one, in other words, will recognise the legitimacy of laws passed by their own rulers, who become simply 'them'. In the end, only despotism will rule in this country in the future. And then the fighting will start.

MADHOUSE BRITAIN

THE National Lottery has made a grant of £53,000 to a Jamaican woman, who styles herself a 'poet', so that she can take two years' holiday travelling around her ethnic homeland obtaining inspiration for her works.

Miss Jean Breeze, who nowadays resides in Leicester, says that she needs the inspiration in order to bring out a book of her reggae-style poetry. For the past 16 years she has worked in Britain as a poet, teacher and theatre director but she complains that this is "repetitive and not conducive to sustained creative work."

* * *

ASYLUM-SEEKERS are being sent by taxi on journeys of hundreds of miles at taxpayers' expense to find somewhere for them to stay.

On one occasion, a family was sent from Liverpool to Dover at a cost of £400, while another was sent from Liverpool to Birmingham at a cost of £220.

Though sending them by coach or train would be far cheaper, it is said that many of them do not speak sufficient English to find their way.

* * *

EDINBURGH University plans to ban Christian prayers at graduation ceremonies and replace them with a period of 'reflection' to avoid offen-

ding other faiths and protect itself from legal action.

The University made the decision after receiving complaints from students and staff who felt the centuries-old tradition of prayers did not reflect their diverse beliefs. A report by Michael Anderson, the senior vice-principal, highlighted concerns that Christian prayers could lead to charges of discrimination.

* * *

TEENAGE tearaways sentenced for a spell at the Wetherby Young Offender Institution in West Yorkshire might be excused thinking they have arrived at a holiday camp. On arrival, they are handed 'goody bags' containing sweets, colouring books and pens. They are then likely to take part in an Easter egg hunt and watch a clown performing a juggling act. They will spend long hours playing arcade-style video games.

This is the reality of the 'child-friendly' régime at the institution as described by a warder who works at the place, who said it was "absolutely ridiculous."

* * *

WHILE we are on the subject of places of detention, the latest move by the Government is that Her Majesty's Prison Service will no longer be

known by that name. All words signifying the royal connection are to be dropped, and the new name of 'National Offenders Management Service' (NOMS) will be adopted.

In addition, the uniforms traditionally worn by prison officers are thought 'too authoritarian' and will be scrapped. They will be replaced by more casual garb, said to resemble tracksuits.

* * *

PC Lee Worsfold of Croydon Police is allowed to dress as a woman two years before he has a sex-change operation.

The 24-year-old has grown his hair long, wears make-up and woman's clothes and carries a handbag. A police spokesman confirmed he has the full support of senior management.

Lee, now known as Lou, has swapped his male uniform for a woman's uniform. Police chiefs have refused to confirm whether or not he/she will be using the ladies' toilet and changing rooms, but they have denied claims that he/she will be given a year's paid leave when he/she has the 'gender-change' operation.

* * *

ASYLUM-seekers are being handed up to £20,000 each in back-dated benefits if they are granted refugee status.

That payout was made to a Kosovan even though he was housed and supported by the state while his case was being considered. It covered four years' back pay while he waited.

IN the 14th to 17th centuries in Europe and the United States, 'Witchcraft hysteria' swept through most countries. Tens of thousands of completely innocent men, women and children were burnt, tortured, maimed, imprisoned and in other ways persecuted. Religious 'heresy' too was severely punished. Deviate from the accepted standards of the ruling religion of your country and you faced persecution – even death.

they resort to the same sort of measures as the witch-burners of olden times. Race laws and public order acts abound, getting tougher and stricter all the time. Persecute, prosecute, fine and imprison those 'racists' (nearly always white) who voice any outspoken opposition to the catastrophe of the multi-racial society. "We never made a mistake, so lock up anybody who says we did!" is their cry.

Race Police abound. Spies and elect-

Council Housing Office!

It's not that long ago that ultra-Zionist Jack Straw was even contemplating prosecuting people who made 'racist' statements in their own homes! We must suppose he expected their kids to inform the Race Police! Why not go one further, current Home Secretary, and install Big Brother surveillance gadgets in everybody's home. Then you can detect any 'racist' word used. And then the Race Police can smash their way through the windows and make arrests!

All sound like science fiction? All sound like I am exaggerating? I am not! Get into an argument with an immigrant in the street and use a 'racist' word, and you could be arrested.

The rulers of the system will not be satisfied until *all* white nationalist parties everywhere will be shut down and all white nationalists silenced, and they are now making moves against the Net, due to come into force probably next year.

Freedom is the basic right of every person – and that includes Whites from which it is being stolen. If we do not fight for our freedom now, we give in to

'Racism': the new witchcraft

EDDY MORRISON warns of the medieval-style bigotry and fanaticism of today's heretic-hunters

Looking back, we can see now that the whole notion of religious persecution and accusations of witchcraft were complete nonsense. They were based on the total intolerance of the Church or State, and the people persecuted were guilty of nothing worse than mere dissent from the accepted *status quo*. They were really seen as a *political* threat, and often the religious heresy bit was a charge tacked on.

Today, in Europe and America, and especially Britain, we have a new 'witchcraft hysteria' raging through our towns and cities – and its target is 'racism'!

What is racism and why is it such a threat? White racism, or, as we also call it, white nationalism, is the support for the scientifically proved facts of racial differences and for racial separate development – coupled with a total opposition to the disaster which is multi-racialism in all countries in which this tragic experiment is practised.

NO CONSENT

Multi-racialism – multi-culturalism, call it what you will – was foisted upon the white nations of the world by the old party system, without any consent being asked from the white majorities. Subsequently, as it has proved to be the

ronic surveillance scan the Worldwide Web continually – searching, searching, searching for *any* signs of the new heresy.

Don't agree with immigration?

This picture is from the trial of George Jacobs, accused of witchcraft in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1692. He was found guilty and hanged. One point against him was his inability to recite the Lord's Prayer!



Prosecute 'em! Against forced integration? Prosecute 'em! Remotely suspected of uttering 'racist' statements (or even something *likely* to be a 'racist' statement) – risk of prosecution. I know of a case in Leeds of a woman in a street criticising, in a quite reasonable manner, the large number of asylum-seekers' being pushed onto her estate. She was overheard by a liberal busybody and the result was a threat of eviction from the

the new witch-hunters. 'Racism' is becoming the new ultimate crime, and the new breed of cops are building their promotional ladders on 'racist' arrests, whilst in our schools our white kids are under a barrage of multi-racialist lies.

Freedom to speak, think and act is the inalienable right of all white people. Defend it, no matter what group you are in, as your *first* priority. Without the freedom to *speak the truth* all else is lost!

Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.

Thomas Paine

disaster it is, with racial violence and rioting its hallmarks, as well as voluntary segregation of many races who just will *not* be forced to mix, the rulers of the old system could not admit it was wrong. They lack the guts and will to dismantle the multi-racial state, and so

FRIENDS OF SPEARHEAD

Friends of *Spearhead* is a support group that has been formed for the purpose of ensuring our magazine's continued survival.

Members of Friends of *Spearhead* pay a subscription of a minimum of £10 a month, in return for which they may, if they wish, receive five copies of each monthly issue for redistribution (by whatever means they prefer). This subscription may be paid by cheque or direct debit, in which case our bank details will be supplied.

In addition, Friends of *Spearhead* undertakes certain other promotions, details of which are advertised as they occur.

We hope very much that our readers and supporters, not only in the UK but around the world, will rally to help us in this project.

Friends of *Spearhead* can be contacted at PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.

GREAT VOICES FROM THE PAST

Thinkers of the Right: Challenging Materialism (by Kerry Bolton) £12.50. Available from Spearhead Books (see page 25).

This new book, by New Zealand writer Kerry Bolton, is to be welcomed into the libraries of the nationalist movement as a most useful tool in the struggles that lay ahead. As much as we may admire many of the older evergreen books that are available, more modern and recently written works go to prove our organic growth.

Some nationalists may question the use of the word 'Right' to describe the personalities and ideas discussed in this book, as almost all the subjects were revolutionary and certainly against capitalism. The problem here is that, when we are described as being of the 'Right' by sustained and massive weight of enemy propaganda, the actual original meaning of the word becomes lost. In the context of our struggle, however, 'Right' signifies a position at the

patriotism with a quest for social justice, is now taken to mean someone with an uncontrollable desire to murder everyone in sight!

Nevertheless, the readership at which Kerry Bolton's book is aimed will at once know very well what is meant in political terms by 'Right', although some may well be surprised that so many great men of literature have supported our cause.

A common jibe and sneering insult which crops up interminably is one that mockingly claims that the ranks of our movement are filled with morons (to quote even John Bean – former editor of *Combat* – in his book *Many Shades of Black*). The real reason for this is of course our refusal to be intimidated by the terror squads of the organised opposition and to dish out blow for blow when attacked. Nevertheless, the idea that no deeply thinking person ever was, or is, on 'our side' needs correcting.

This book does it, and how! Thirteen chapters, each covering a well-known member of what is, I think wrongly, called the *literati*, fill the pages with appreciation of their novels, manifestos, poems and accounts of heroic action. Ezra Pound, for example, the greatest modern poet the United States of America has ever had or is ever likely to produce, was a fierce advocate of social credit economics, and was a contributor to nationalist magazines before and after the war, as was Henry Williamson, the author of *Tarka the Otter*. Then again, there was the great Irish poet William Butler Yeats, who is, perhaps, not widely known for the marching song he wrote for the Irish Blueshirts. Rex Fairburn of New Zealand and P.R. Stephenson of Australia are not


well known in our hemisphere but they certainly should be, and their contributions to the general cause are outlined in this new book. Other *literati* covered include the Italians D'Annunzio and Marinetti, who contributed that vital urge to action, the lack of which so marks our times; Knut Hamsun, the great Norwegian writer, who was so viciously treated after the war, a tragic case of a victim of political correctness and the post-war purges; and Wyndham Lewis and Roy Campbell, whose stories are particularly fascinating as their 'court' biographers have played down the very features of their work that Kerry Bolton emphasises.

It is perhaps a forlorn hope that this book will kill off the snivelling hypocrites who lisp their effeminate scowls that no men of intellect ever were on our side. What we can all do is to ensure a copy is bought by our very own public library service where at least some people will have access to it.

BOOK EXPLAINS NATIONALISM

What this book also shows and explains is the real difference between patriotic nationalism, as it has developed over the years, and the creeds of capitalism and Marxist socialism. For these latter creeds know no other end than materialism, just the consumerism and sleeping of the mindless herd.

The great men of the last century featured in this book show that there should be a higher ideal than simply to live in a bigger house, to eat and drink more, to titillate every sensual pleasure and to drive a bigger car and watch a bigger television. Their ideal and their vision of the future was to inculcate in the masses the possibility of producing a *better man* – a man close to the soil and to his roots, but with qualities that seem so lacking today: honour, chivalry, kindness, and capacity for action. Mankind should be striving for justice, for fairness in all his doings and, beyond all this, the creation of a more beautiful and truthful world.



EZRA POUND
Outstanding American poet

opposite end of the political spectrum to the internationalist, globalist and inorganic Left – which embraces communism, socialism and international capitalism.

TRICKS OF LANGUAGE

In passing, we may note that this distortion of language has also corrupted the words 'racialist' or 'racist'. It once meant a person who recognised the importance of race and who was proud of his own people. Now, its meaning has been confused by extension to people who hate or wish to persecute other races. Likewise, the expression 'national socialist', which originally referred to a radical reformer combining

Spearhead Support Group formed

We are pleased to announce the formation of the *Spearhead* Support Group, which was launched at a meeting in West Yorkshire last month.

The *Spearhead* Support Group should not be confused with the Friends of *Spearhead*. Whereas the latter is mainly a money-raising body, the purpose of the Support Group is to promote the circulation of the magazine. This is particularly necessary in view of the rule under which *Spearhead* is banned from sale or display at British National Party meetings.

The SSG is independent and non-party. It is also independent of *Spearhead* itself. It is not a part of the *Spearhead* organisation but is entirely self-regulating. The editor of *Spearhead* is sympathetic to its aims and appreciative of its support and work but does not regulate its activities.

The SSG does not have a formal membership, with subscriptions, cards, etc. It will hold occasional meetings and social activities but its principal function will be to serve as a sales agency for the magazine. By next month it will possess its own postal address. In the meantime people interested in helping in its work should contact the following e-mail address: <SpearheadSupportGroup@yahoo.com>

More information next month.

RACE
AND
NATION



The Editor
'Spearhead'
PO Box 2471
Hove
E. Sussex BN3 4DT

SIR: Bliar finds himself on the horns of a dilemma. He wants to flood Britain with immigrants until the indigenous white population has been outnumbered and reduced to impotence. At the same time, he knows that with every immigrant who sets foot on British soil the risk of a terror-ist attack like the ones in Madrid becomes greater – and with such an attack the certainty of a sparking of civil unrest among the long-suffering British people.
N.G. CHARNLEY
Blackpool, Lancs.

SIR: It now appears that Al-Qaida was responsible for the Madrid bombings. This is something I anticipated some months ago, and I am only surprised it has not happened earlier.

One's heart aches for those who lost their lives and for their remaining families, the majority of whom most likely opposed the immoral invasion of Iraq.

I am afraid that because Spain decided to join the Axis of Evil – that is Israel, America and Britain – she now feels the inevitable whiplash of resentment felt by the Iraqi people and the Islamic world generally against the evil escapade in Iraq.

The former Spanish Prime Minister, Senor Aznar, inherited a strong and independent country that was the legacy of General Franco, who emphatically would never have committed Spain to the US-led coalition against Saddam Hussein. It is no more than his just deserts that his electorate has now thrown him out.
PHILIP FORDER-WHITE
Charlton, Shaftsbury, Dorset

SIR: Prime Minister Blair is the least qualified person in Britain to lecture the population on the threat of international terrorism. Given that the main threat to this country comes from Islamic and Irish terrorists, no politician has done more to facilitate their operations. He has done nothing to prevent vast numbers of people sympathetic to, and in many cases actively supportive of, the terrorist campaign against the West from entering our towns and cities. More than that, he has criminalised resistance to the Muslim invasion, appointed leading IRA members to government office and released hundreds of convicted terrorists into the population. And now he resorts to the oldest trick in the treacherous politician's book: he thunders about the threat from abroad in order to distract attention from the failures of his own Government at home. So the gallery of those chiefly responsible for the growth of

international terrorism has to include Blair and other pillars of the liberal consensus, alongside Osama bin Laden and other known terrorists around the world. Remove Muslims from the population and the threat from Islamic fundamentalists in Britain virtually disappears. Remove Blair and his kind from office and the threat from any kind of terrorism is dramatically reduced. Think about it: could Churchill have made his wartime speeches while presiding over the admission of millions of German immigrants? As they say nowadays, get real!

FRANK KIMBAL JOHNSON
Louth, Lincs.

SIR: With almost daily reports of death and carnage in Iraq, the can of worms opened by Bush and Blair becomes ever more apparent. The only thing that surprises me is the total amazement of these two at the consequences of their policies.

The Iraq of Saddam Hussein contained many mutually hostile factions: various Christians, Islamic fundamentalists, Sunni Muslims, Shi-ite Muslims, Kurds, secular nationalists and others. One could argue that only a dictator could stop the country being torn apart.

George and Tony should dwell in the real world. In the real world different religions and races simply can't live in peace and harmony together. Each faction quite naturally vies with the others to gain all the power and influence for itself that it can.
DEREK SUMMERS
Bolton, Lancs.

SIR: Michael Howard is on dangerous ground when he starts speaking of criminal politicians. His party has many claims to being at the forefront in terms of the number of 'major criminals' in its ranks. There is the fugitive 'Lady' Porter, who hides away in Israel, whose authorities will not return her to face the British courts over the 'homes-for-votes' scandal. There is also the liar and ex-convict Jeffrey Archer and the convicted liar Jonathan Aitken. They were big Tory names before being found out, and you can 'betcha' life there are many others.

One wonders how many hidden criminals sleep in coffins at Conservative Central Office. Perhaps they obey their master, who may have the 'Transylvanian' technique of only awakening them when more blood-sucking is required!
ALEXANDER BARON
London SE.26

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Baron must have anticipated what was said at the Burnley BNP meeting on the 4th March. See pages 6-8 of this issue).

SIR: Nigel Jackson wrote a very critical assessment of Pauline Hanson in the March *Spearhead*, but several points need to be considered.

Hanson is not a fictional super-heroine like 'Wonder Woman' or 'Buffy'. She had to face an unprecedented storm of hatred and

vilification without any real back-up, training or experience to help her, so it was surely inevitable that she would fail.

Mr. Jackson fails to make it clear whether or not Pauline Hanson was involved in electoral fraud, and makes the rather obfuscating comment that: "It appears to the writer... that no proof of serious miscarriage of justice has so far been brought forward." Well, better luck next time! The fact is that the Queensland Court of Appeal overturned the three-year sentence. Is that not good enough for him?

Hanson's One Nation party stood a candidate against independent MP Graeme Campbell and his Australia First party, which may be the main reason for the loss of his (Campbell's) seat. But Lady Birdwood, another outstanding nationalist, similarly stood against the National Front in the UK, and much more recently the BNP has also stood against the NF in elections, in the West Midlands for example. Nationalist leaders tend to think they are totally right and everybody else is totally wrong, including other nationalists, who are 'nazis', 'liberals' or 'traitors' – according to your taste. So Hanson's actions are typical of most nationalist leaders, if foolish. What is to stop Campbell standing for another seat?

Pauline Hanson made a token denunciation of 'anti-semitism', but by Mr. Jackson's own admission she was opposed to the Iraq war and to the (economic and military) forces of globalism. So, leaving aside more esoteric considerations, such as revisionist history and criticism of the *Talmud*, she has certainly made the grade as an 'anti-semite'.
PAUL BALLARD
Sutton, Surrey

SIR: At the local Halifax, where I bank, I experienced a delay in the notification of my new cheque book. Finally, I spoke to a member of the staff whom I have known for some time. I stated that I had written out and sent a cheque to the BNP. This was then stopped without any authorisation from me.

The Halifax employee was obviously shocked by this. She left her desk and returned a few minutes later with an apology for the hassle I had suffered. Later on, I was informed that a West African employee may have been involved in this episode!
MARIE HUGHES (Mrs.)
London S.W.19

SIR: If I stood in the street and shouted hate messages against Muslims I would be arrested for inciting racial hatred. Why is it then possible for Muslim cleric Abu Hamza to remain in Britain when he praises a suicide bomber who murdered a British soldier?

I, for one, can recall that John Tyndall and John Morse were imprisoned in 1986 for expressing honest and truthful opinions about the multi-racial society.
MARK TWIDDY
London E.7

Another own goal

From what we have seen and heard of Mr. Alastair Campbell, he would not be our first, second, third or even nineteenth choice as a dinner companion. It seems that he is prone to become irritated, maybe even abusive, when someone does not agree with him. A few weeks ago, he attended the New Den in the shape of a Burnley supporter, and was appalled at the racist chants and taunts emanating from the ranks of the Millwall crowd. He is, of course, one of that fraternity which never looks for reasons but is desperately keen to impose its own brand of authoritarian solutions. "Sit on it! Stamp it out! Lock 'em up!" says Alastair who, as a football fan, should really know better.

Long before 'racism' was invented, the terraces, usually on a Saturday afternoon, provided a working bloke's paradise of anonymity where for a couple of hours he could lose himself and put life's little problems out of his mind. Today, the working blokes so loathed by Mr. Campbell are, as we all know, hemmed in from morning till night with ludicrous laws and restrictions seeking to regulate what they may say, think, and do. They never asked for a multi-racial society, and would doubtless be quite content just to hurl abuse at the ref in the absence of any other provocation.

Paying the price

Defence Minister Hoon has discovered that he cannot make ends meet on the MoD's annual £30-plus billion budget. His most pressing problem is funding the Government's overseas adventures in Afghanistan, the Balkans and Iraq. Keeping 11,000 of our men in the latter country is costing around £80 million every month – over and above the several billions (no accurate figure yet available) thrown away on the illegal invasion. As one newspaper correspondent has put it, "The charge that Blair has to answer is that Britain cannot afford the energetic foreign policy that he has pursued, that it has been punching above its weight by virtue of spending above its means." That, in a way, is good news, but offers little comfort to those of us who are very much more concerned as to our ability to defend our own homeland.

THE WAY WE LIVE NOW

Some observations on contemporary society
by JUNIUS

Advertisement

BLUNKETT TOURS: The latest concept in comfort and economy. Why bother with tiring, tiresome overseas travel, when we can bring the whole wide world to your doorstep?

Who comes wins...

And yet, apropos our spoof above, there are actually people who reckon that our Home Secretary should be softer on asylum-seekers. Journalist Anthony Howard, observes that: "Blunkett has moved with the tactical skill and cunning that has become his trademark. Asylum-seekers are not only the least powerful but also the least popular components of our community." Analyse this! Until granted the right to stay, these people are in no way components of our community at all! And we have every right to send them packing back to whence they came. As for their being the least powerful, we are certain that all our folk who have lived here all their lives would be more than happy to receive just a little of the bounty showered upon people who have only yesterday crept in through the back door.

... and goes on winning

But Mr. Howard – the journalist, not the bungling opportunist who 'leads' the opposition! – faces fierce competition from recently recruited Times hack, Julie Burchill. This lady specialises in silly, often unreadable, tirades about whatever comes into her head, and a few weeks ago she launched a masterpiece titled: 'I dare to say it: white immigration is wrong.' While Julie just revels in cosmopolitanism, she is, it seems, not altogether happy about an influx of East Europeans, and Hungarians in particular. One of her arguments is that: "We weren't there, and they shouldn't be here." Working on that basis, we ought, right now, to be bidding a fond farewell to thousands of Algerians,

Moroccans etc., as well as boatloads of Orientals. However, the lady continues: "... but it was the immigrants who came here 30 years after the war who helped to bring us up, bring us out, bring us home. Whether nursing us or keeping their shops open for our convenience, they kept on giving to the mother country, and finally they taught us fair play." This must be the worst case of verbal diarrhoea ever to find its way into print!

Hear no evil

It is called the International War Crimes Tribunal, and this is how it works. When the presiding judge, Richard May, feels that the court has heard enough of what Mr. Slobodan Milosevic has to say, he switches off the defendant's microphone. But the former Serbian leader could have the last laugh. Mr. May, a one-time Labour election candidate, is not feeling too good, and intends to quit the case on May 31st, its midway point. At this juncture his replacement will have to brief himself on thousands of pages of evidence and testimony, and Mr. Milosevic has the right to challenge the appointment of the new judge, or even ask for a retrial. Two other brilliant jurists, from Jamaica and South Korea, must then decide how they will move on. Meanwhile, that hard-pressed bit-player, Carla del Ponte, the tribunal's chief prosecutor, bemoans the failure of Belgrade to come up with military records vital to her case for proving genocide. Could this mean that the Serbs have defiantly decided to stick up for one of their own? How very naughty!

When the Sky really is the limit

"Marem Hernandez, Dream Team's sexy Swiss Miss, smouldered in the Gossard Wonderbra (Good heavens! Where was the fire brigade?)

and also made the Ford Focus look sexy." By letter and by e-mail we have begged Mr. Murdoch to stop mailing us his Sky Magazine, but alas, regularly every month, details of the exploits and singularly unimportant achievements of eminently forgettable people such as Miss Hernandez are shoved through our letter box. However, the downside does not stop there. In the March issue of this ghastly little comic there were no less than six full-page adverts offering loans, obviously aimed at that most vulnerable sector of our community, i.e. the people who trawl all 120 pages of this puerile nonsense.

Dogs of war

As we understand it, the greatest benefit to be derived from the overthrow of evil and repressive régimes is that the oppressed peoples will subsequently be introduced to the values of western-style democracy. And, of all these values, we are advised that 'freedom' is paramount, even if the word is never properly defined and means a dozen different things to as many different people. As an example, the Afghans are now free to organise a favourite national sporting event where, on parched wasteland north of Kabul, two fighting dogs battle for supremacy in the heat of the mid-day sun, to the raucous cheers of several thousand spectators. This depraved activity was illegal until November 2001, when the much maligned Taliban was toppled by George W. Bush and his allies under the pretext of combating terrorism. Predictably, polls indicate that fewer than one in four of us British want Bush to win a second term. For those who enjoy statistics, his November visit, when he crept in and out of Britain like a thief in the night, cost taxpayers almost £4 million. What a wicked waste of resources!

He had it taped

Baghdad April 1st 2009. Shortly after his execution for war crimes and genocide, Mr. Jack Straw announced that he felt fighting fit, and that everything was going well, everywhere. Later in the day an Iraqi government spokesman confirmed that an audio system, successfully removed *post-mortem*, would be buried separately for reasons of national security.

SPEARHEAD BOOKS

**PO Box 247 I, Hove,
East Sussex BN3 4DT**

Ancient Eugenics (Allen G. Roper, BA) £3.50. How our forefathers maintained the quality of the race.

Anglo-American Establishment, The (Carroll Quigley) £12.95. A factual appraisal of the realities of power politics and a study of groups that work behind the scenes to influence world events.

Anglo Italian Symposium 1938, £7.00. Presentations by Ezra Pound, Rev. Nye, Father J.C. Copleston, Lt. Col. Cyril Rocke, Rear Admiral W.E.R. Martin and others at the Institute of Cultural Affairs in Pavia.

Anglo-Saxon Riddles (John Porter) £4.95. Ingenious characters who speak their names in riddles. A sparkling translation retaining all their original vigour and subtlety.

Animal Welfare in Germany (K.R. Bolton) £3.95. An impartial look at some pioneer legislation which was quickly repealed by the allies after World War II.

Arriba Espana (Major F. Yeats Brown) £8.95. An eye-witness and professional view of the situation in Spain during the Civil War.

Atrocities: The Moral Question (Sir Oswald Mosley) £4.50. How Europe is poisoned by hypocrisy and one-sided allegations.

Banking Swindle, The (Kerry Bolton) £4.50. Short biographies of those who have opposed the charging of interest on money created by mere 'book entry' without regard to real wealth or productive capacity.

Battle of Maldon, The (Bill Griffiths) £4.95. Describes the famous battle between the men of Essex and the Vikings fought in AD 991. The book includes source text, edited text, paralleled literal translation, verse and notes on pronunciation.

Behind Communism (Frank Britton) £2.95. A treatise on the role of Jews within the communist movement.

Behind The Lodge Door (Paul A. Fisher) £16.75. About the influence of Masonic secret societies on church and state.

Bell Curve, The (Richard J. Herrnstein and Charles Murray) £19.95. Breaks new ground and old taboos! Describes the deliberate creation of a new underclass, with racial connotations.

Beowulf (John Porter) £8.95. The verse in which the story unfolds is the finest writing in old English text that exists. A literal word-by-word translation is printed opposite the edited text.

Best Witness (Michael Collins Piper) £17.95. Mel Memelstein and the trial and triumph of historical revisionism.

Beyond Tears (Catherine Buckle) £14.95. The tragic story of the post-colonial history of Rhodesia, with the country's reversion to barbarism, famine and horror.

Blood Ritual (Philip de Vier) £7.95. An impartial examination into the anti-Jewish 'Blood Libel' accusation.

The prices given here include postal charges for dispatch within the British Isles. For postage overseas please enquire before ordering.

Payments should be made to 'Spearhead Books' and sent to the above address.

Spearhead Books handles works by numerous and varied independent authors. It should not need stating that the publisher of Spearhead may not necessarily endorse all the contents of these works.

By Way of Deception (Victor Ostrovsky) £11.00. A former Mossad (Israeli intelligence Service) agent defects and tells his amazing story.

Can Liberals be Educated? (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.30. No! The writer explains why.

Captain McKilliam Memorial Archive (Capt. K.R. McKilliam) £10.00. Four booklets of particular interest to Christians and students of conspiracies.

Cheats and Fraudsters (E. Morgan) £3.50. How Governments fleece the people out of their hard-earned cash.

Churchill's War Vol. I (David Irving) £23.95. The first book in a two-part set. This book changes forever the way World War II is viewed.

Churchill's War Vol. II (David Irving) £29.30. The history of the middle and later years of World War Two.

Codreanu and the Iron Guard (Keith Thompson) £3.90. The inspiring and tragic story of Romania's nationalist movement.

Cost of a Reputation (Ian Mitchell) £17.95. About the libel case of Aldington versus Tolstoy and operation Keelhaul.

Death of a City (Michael McLoughlin) £3.50. The tragic story of the destruction of the city of Hamburg by wartime bombing and the resulting firestorm.

Deculturation of the English People (John Lovejoy) £5.95. The sad story of the process by which the English people are in essence being destroyed, and a remedy to reverse the situation.

Demjanjuk Affair, The (Yoram Sheftel) £23.00. The rise and fall of a show trial.

Destruction of Dresden, The (David Irving) £25.00. 1995 hardback edition. The pitiful story of the annihilation of a city and its people.

Distortion (Lt. Col. 'Jack' Mohr, US Army) £3.95. An explanation of Christian doctrine and its relation to the war against Satanism.

En Route to Global Occupation (Gary H. Kah) £12.75. A high-ranking government liaison officer exposes the secret agenda for world unification.

Enemies of the Queen (Kitty Little Ph.D.) £3.90. Written with the author's personal knowledge and experiences of 'the enemy within'.

English Heroic Legends (Kathleen Herbert) £9.95. The authoress's encyclopaedic knowledge

of the period is reflected in the wealth of detail she brings to these tales of adventure, passion, bloodshed and magic.

Ethnostate, The (Wilmot Robertson) £15.95. A brilliant blueprint for a post-liberal society where race becomes a constructive binding agent. A book to provoke much thought on why you think as you do.

Evita, The New Feminism (Evita Peron) £3.90. A selection of essays by this most revered personality.

Fable of the Ducks and the Hens, The (George Lincoln Rockwell) £5.00. A colourful cartoon style A-4 book telling the story of 'Asylum Seekers' in a modern parable form. An excellent gift for children.

Ferenc Szalasi and the Arrow Cross. £3.30. In far-away Hungary, a country about which most people know little, an epic struggle took place and a system called co-nationalism developed.

Fiend and Felon (Gerd Honsik) £10.50. The author shows the unsavoury side of Simon Wiesenthal and how perjury and murder follow in his footsteps.

Final Secret of Pearl Harbour, The (R.A. Theobald) £12.00. All the mysteries of the 'surprise' attack explained.

Generalship of Alexander the Great, The (Maj. Gen. J.F.C. Fuller) £7.25. A biography and study of one of the world's greatest war leaders.

Giant With Feet of Clay (Jurgen Graf) £10.00. A thorough critique of Raul Hilberg's *The Destruction of European Jewry*.

Gift of Ramu, The (Alexander Baron) £3.00. This fascinating novel tells of a wonderful gift to mankind and its consequences for the 'money power'.

Grand Design, The (Douglas Reed) £3.50. A lifetime of experience and knowledge are drawn upon to explain the hidden causes of our people's distress.

Great Money Reformers (L. Wise) £9.00. Three booklets which detail the lives and ideas of Silvio Gesell, Arthur Kitson and Frederick Soddy regarding the 'Money Question'. A valuable background for all those who are interested in Social Credit ideas.



Grip of Death (Michael Rowbottom) £17.95. A lucid account of why virtually all the money in the economy has been created as debt to the banks.

Guild Alternative, The (Arthur Penty) £3.75. An answer to the chaos of the modern world based on traditional Christian social teaching.

Hall of Mirrors (David Sinclair) £18.99. The Treaty of Versailles and the injustices within it that made the Second World War inevitable.

Hobbit, The (J.R.R. Tolkien) £6.95. The moral imperatives of the Northern European shine through in this great saga.

Holocaust Affirmers (Alexander Baron) £10.75.



A hard look at the people pushing the 'holocaust' stories.

Horus Saves (E.A. McCallum) £4.95. An historical novel illustrating conquests of nations by religion.

Hunter (Andrew McDonald) £5.75. An exciting novel about a young man who rebels against race mixing and 'democratic' oppression.

Irish Blueshirts (Keith Thompson) £2.50. About an organisation set firmly against both the IRA and Communism.

Iron Curtain Over America (John Beaty) £7.50. The long story about the epic struggle between Asia and Europe, from the Teutonic Knights to the Communist nuclear spies.

Iron Maze (Gordon Brook-Shepherd) £7.99. About the link between the Western secret services and the Bolsheviks.

Islam and the Reich (Atualla Bogdan Kopanski Ph.D.) £3.50. A fascinating account of how members of the Islamic community volunteered to enlist in the German forces wherever and whenever they had the opportunity.

Jew, the Gipsy and El Islam, The (Sir Richard F. Burton) £19.00. This famous explorer, writer and adventurer reveals all he discovered during his exciting life.

John Hargrave and the Greenshirts (Kerry Bolton) £2.75. The history and development of the militant arm of the social credit movement in Britain.

Land and the People (Jorian Jenks) £3.30. One of the founders of the Soil Association sets out his ideas for the revitalisation of Britain's agri-culture. A pre-war Blackshirt publication.

Liars Ought to Have Good Memories (Alexander Baron) £4.95. An accurate exposure of the workings of the Communist-Jewish lie factory otherwise known as *Searchlight* magazine.

Life of John Birch, The (Robert Welch) £8.00. The life story of the man who gave his name to one of the most important anti-Communist organisations in America.

Lightning and the Sun, The (Savitri Devi) £7.95. Three figures from history compared: Akhnaton, Genghis Khan and Adolf Hitler.

Lincoln's Negro Policy (Ernest Sevier Cox) £4.95. Contrary to what is currently believed, President Lincoln planned repatriation for America's Blacks.

Looking for the Lost Gods of England (Kathleen Herbert) £4.95. The tales, beliefs and traditions of ancient times are still with us and able to stir our minds and imaginations.

March to Sanity (Major-General J.F.C. Fuller) £4.20. Commonsense ideas that could have saved Britain from the horrors of war.

Money: Questions and Answers (Father Charles E. Coughlin) £10.75. The famous inter-war American 'Radio Priest' explains why money should be the servant of the people and not its master.

Moses Hess: Prophet of Communism and Zionism (Shlomo Avineri) £6.50. Why do Communism and Zionism both have the same destructive ends? This book investigates.

My Awakening (David Duke) £24.00. One of the finest books to deal with issues which are of concern to white men everywhere.

My Banned Holocaust Interview (Carlo Mattogno) £6.50. A leading Italian history revisionist had his studies and conclusions banned. This is his work published privately.

Myth of the Noble Savage, The (Kerry Bolton) £6.75. The falsification of history as a cultural weapon.

Onward Christian Soldiers (Donald Day) £4.00. Propaganda and censorship in Eastern Europe. A man's struggle for truth. 1920-1942.

Other Concentration Camps (Jeffrey Hamm) £2.50. Born in South Wales and arrested in the Falkland Islands in 1940, he was interned without charge or trial. This is the story.

Out of Step (Arnold Leese) £3.95. The life story of one of Britain's foremost experts on the Jewish question.

Party System, The (Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton) £4.00. A critique of the fraudulent parliamentary system. First written in 1911, this edition has a preface by Aidan Mackey.

Populism and Élitism (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.95. A study of the influences of élite groups on societies throughout history.

Race Books (J.B. Isherwood) £4.00. Four books entitled *Man's Racial Nature*; *Race and Kinship*; *Race and Politics* and *Religion and the Racial Controversy*.

Racial Realities in Europe (Lothrop Stoddard) £7.25. An examination of the various ethnic types that made up modern Europe before the current black invasion.

Rebirth of England and English (Fr. Andrew Phillips) £4.95. The vision of the Dorset poet William Barnes (1801-1886). In search of our post-industrial age, the folk nationalist will learn much from this book.

Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans (Prof. Hans Gunther) £7.95. Translated by the late Vivian Bird, a study of the pre-Christian faiths of our people.

Rising Tide of Colour, The (Lothrop Stoddard) £7.25. About the growing demographic threat to white survival. A very relevant warning for the present generation.

Rudolf Report, The (Germar Rudolf) £20.00. A scientific examination of the 'gas chambers' of Auschwitz and related issues. 450 pages.

Runes (J. Dees) £11.95. An entertaining and instructive book on the meaning of these ancient symbols and the mythology of each individual sign. A beautiful production.

Settlers in Eastern and Central Africa (Capt. K.R. McKilliam) £3.90. A first-hand view by a colonial education officer of how white rule was undermined by British politicians, to the detriment not only of Whites but also of the native Africans.

Soviet Evidence of Katyn (Carlos Porter) £2.75. A detailed exposure of the Soviet lies regarding the brutal Katyn killings and how the Germans were blamed.

Stranger Than Fiction (Anon.) £6.00. An amazing and detailed report of the 'hidden hand' behind the destruction of the World Trade Centre. Convincing and authenticated revelations and research.

Taxation and the People (Sir Oswald Mosley) £2.50. Proposals for a fairer system for all.

Teddy Bare (Zad Rust) £11.00. About the last of the Kennedy Brothers.

Temple of Wotan (Ron McVan) £18.50. The mysteries of antiquity and the ethnic spiritual mythos of the Euro-Pagan world, explained with the ceremonies and rituals of Wotanism.

That Bastard Churchill (Major M.F. Thurgood) £5.60. A blistering attack on the warlord Churchill and an exposure of his disastrous financial policies, vile temper, tragic wartime strategy, and pet foibles.

They Dare Speak Out (Paul Findley) £16.95. Many examples of how the Israeli lobby in the USA ruins politicians, academics and patriotic citizens who dare even to ask for debate on the Palestine question.

Thinkers of the Right: Challenging Materialism (Kerry Bolton) £12.50. Great writers and thinkers of the 20th century who supported the 'Radical Right'.

Among the personalities covered are Evola, Marinetti, Williamson, Campbell, Yeats, Pound, Mishima and D.H. Lawrence.

Turner Diaries, The (Andrew McDonald) £9.50. An exciting futuristic tale of the white backlash.

Under the Flat Stones (Ted Budden) £2.95. Some of the best essays from this popular nationalist.

Usury (Hilaire Belloc) £2.25. A concise explanation of usury and its inherent evil.

Ventilations (Wilmot Robertson) £9.50. A series of essays covering many aspects of racial nationalism and revealing great perception and knowledge of world events.

Vikings (J. Wooding) £8.95. About the lives, history, mythology and influence of our Norse ancestors.

Western Civilisation and the Soviet Union (D. Heald) £2.50. A selection of quotes praising Stalin and the other 'Red Dictatorships' by a range of 'liberal' intellectuals. These are words the authors would like forgotten.

White Power (George Lincoln Rockwell) £11.00. One of those books never to be forgotten. The ship of state, the friends of the Captain and the disaster!

Who Holds the Balance? (K.J. Hury) £4.75. About the subversion of Western Man by the masters of the media.



Why Civilisations Self-Destruct (Elmer Pendell) £10.30. An examination of the reasons why societies die out, with examples from ancient to modern times.

Witness to History (Michael Walsh) £4.00. There are probably more facts and quotes regarding the 3rd Reich in this A4 magazine-size book than in any other publication.

Wotan (Carl Gustav Jung) £3.50. An examination of the Northern God, Wotan as an archetypal image deep within the European psyche.

Yesterday and Tomorrow £4.50. Essays by various nationalist authors about the tradition of national revolution.

Your National Identity (Capt. K.R. McKilliam) £2.50. A Christian view of nationalism and identity. Contains maps, regalia and emblems.



Mrs. Griffin speaks at Rochdale

ROCHDALE branch of the British National Party held a very successful meeting on the 24th February, the high point of which was a fantastic collection in which an audience of 45-50 contributed the staggering sum of £1,534.00!

Burnley Councillor Patricia Thompson was the first speaker at the meeting. She was followed by North West regional organiser

Bev Jones. Branch organiser Kevin Bryan, chairing the meeting, then conducted the collection using the 'Dutch auction' method. This presented a challenge because one of the members had offered to match what was collected from the floor up to a limit of £500. This provided a tremendous incentive to others to dig into their pockets, and the result was the £1,534.00 mentioned earlier.



ROCHDALE MEETING: JACKIE GRIFFIN SPEAKS

How to obtain *Spearhead*

Make sure of your regular copy of *Spearhead* by becoming a subscriber. Please fill in the form here and send it to us, together with payment, as directed. Please note also the rates for bulk-buyers.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

ENCLOSED SUBSCRIPTION OF.....

PLUS DONATION (IF ANY) OF.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick box where applicable):-

British Isles £24.00 ☐; Overseas surface mail £26.50 ☐; Air mail Europe £28.50 ☐; Air mail elsewhere £35.00 ☐.

PLEASE NOTE: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling. If remittance is in any other currency, an additional charge of £4.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2.50 in the case of banknotes, these paying for banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies £1.10 each; 20-49 copies £1.00 each; 50-99 copies 83p each; 100-199 copies 69p each; 200-499 copies 60p each; 500 copies 55p each. For advice on postal rates for these quantities please contact our office.

All cheques and postal or money orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT. Please do not include payment for *Spearhead* in a remittance which includes payment for other items.

FANTASTIC COLLECTION RAISED!

There was then a break during which people bought literature and merchandise and tucked into a very welcome buffet.

After the break, Miss Jennifer Griffin, daughter of the party's chairman, made her maiden speech. She related her recent appearance on Welsh TV and spoke also about her friends in the Young BNP.

Then followed the main speaker of the evening, Jackie Griffin, wife of the party chairman. Mrs. Griffin spoke about the sorry state of the health service, in which she works, and how important it was to get the party's Euro candidates elected.

The evening was a very enjoyable one and it made a refreshing change having women constituting the entire panel of speakers.

REPORT FROM KEVIN BRYAN


The Eleventh Hour

The Eleventh Hour has been described as the 'Bible' of the British National Party. First published in 1988, the latest (1998) edition has been updated to take in the many new developments on the political scene occurring since. Written by the founder of the British National Party, John Tyndall, the book gives comprehensive coverage of all the major current issues affecting Britain. It delves into the ideologies of liberalism, conservatism and the left, and also examines that of British Nationalism and its background. It contains extensive analyses of the British economy and political system. It looks at issues connected with freedom and order, the mass media, the environment, race and immigration, Northern Ireland, the Commonwealth, foreign policy and defence. It also gives a detailed outline of the development of the BNP and its predecessor organisations in Britain.

The *Eleventh Hour* runs to 537 pages. It is partly autobiographical, giving an account of the author's origins, early political awakening and subsequent life's work.

Price: Hardback £25.00 plus £4.58 p&p; softback £17.50 plus £3.67 p&p. Please make out cheques to Albion Press and send to PO Box 2471, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 4DT.

JOHN TYNDALL



The book you must read if you want to find out what John Tyndall and the BNP stand for

GREAT BURNLEY MEETING

THE monthly meeting of the British National Party's Burnley branch which took place on the 4th March was one of the most successful for some time. The branch once again welcomed as guest speakers *Spearhead* editor John Tyndall and former BNP national organiser Richard Edmonds.

The attendance was not quite as large as when the two spoke in Burnley last May, on which occasion some 140 people were present. However, since that time the branch has been going through a bit of a temporary rough patch due to internal problems, largely externally afflicted. These are now being ironed out and a recovery is well on the way. Between 100 and 110 were in attendance on the 4th.

John Tyndall's speech is being reproduced on pages 6-8 of this issue and so no more need be said about it here. The meeting was ably chaired by former North West regional organiser Chris Jackson, who received an excellent reception from the audience. He introduced the first speaker, Len Starr, who leads the BNP group on Burnley Council. Mr. Starr gave a calm and very reassuring account of the unfortunate affair of Councillor Maureen Stowe, who obtained her seat as a BNP candidate using BNP money to finance her campaign and BNP activists as campaign helpers, then deserted the party to sit as an independent, joining forces with the party's



BURNLEY: CHRIS JACKSON SPEAKS. COUNCILLOR LEN STARR IS SEATED

opponents to condemn it. The party may be one councillor weaker for Mrs. Stowe's departure, Mr. Starr said, but in every other way it was stronger. She never really fitted with the BNP nor understood its policies.

After Len Starr, Richard Edmonds, ever popular as a speaker with North West audiences, spoke about the vital importance to the party of the coming local government elections, particularly in places like Burnley,

where there were such tremendous opportunities for a breakthrough. He also said how much the BNP's successes in Burnley had inspired activists all over the country by the demonstration of what could be done. Burnley BNP, he said, could be enormously proud of this achievement.

The meeting ended in great enthusiasm and a feeling that local problems were well on the way to being healed.

Young BNP man beats student ban

TONY WENTWORTH, Young BNP leader and a student at Salford University, won a battle last month against an attempted ban on him engaging in any student union politics on the campus for a two-month period.

The ban was imposed on the pretext of an alleged incident in a student night club. Its real purpose, however, was to disqualify him from standing in an election

to the post of local editor of *Student Direct*, the largest (in circulation) student newspaper in the UK.

The union official behind the ban, one Adam Lambert, a left-wing militant and well-known hater of the BNP, promised big demonstrations against Tony if he was allowed to stand in the election, saying: "I'm appalled by the decision to let him run in an election. This is a member of the BNP,



TONY WENTWORTH

a racist, fascist party that wants to divide the student movement and smash this country's democracy" – all rubbish of course, and indeed words which make it clear that Mr. Lambert is much more an enemy of democracy than Tony Wentworth or the BNP.

The ban was imposed on Tony the day after he submitted his nomination paper for the election. However, he appealed and successfully argued that the evidence against him was totally inaccurate and a complete fabrication.

The result of the election will be known

by the time this issue reaches the reader, but whatever it is Tony Wentworth must be congratulated on this victory against petty tyranny and left-wing bullying. He promises us a fuller report on the proceedings for next month.

Tyndall in Clitheroe, April 28th

For those not already informed, John Tyndall will be speaking at the meeting of the BNP's Clitheroe (Lancs.) branch on Wednesday, the 28th April. Those wishing to attend can obtain further details by ringing organiser Wayne Cox at 07816 489812.

SPEARHEAD SUPPORT FUND

Income from the sales of our magazine is not enough to cover full production and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so that we may remain solvent,

Also, because of the controversial nature of the opinions expressed in these columns, it is impossible to induce wholesale distributors to handle the magazine. Hence another need for additional financial support.

Please send all contributions to *Spearhead*, PO Box 2471, Hove, East Sussex BN3 4DT. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested – in which case an SAE would be appreciated. Thanks.

Intolerance from the apostles of 'tolerance'

THE front page of the *Edinburgh Evening News* of March 3rd carried three items. At the top was an advert for a 'Win a car' competition. Below on the right was an announcement that pop singer Tom Jones was due to make an appearance at a concert at Edinburgh Castle. But dominating the page was a screaming headline saying 'Anger as BNP launch Lothian branch'.

Anger? Well of course, the British National Party's most diehard opponents are never happy when it establishes a presence in an area. But this is supposed to be a democracy. The party has every right to campaign wherever in the United Kingdom it chooses, just as its opponents have every right to campaign against it. But from headlines like these one might think otherwise. Spotting this headline on a news stand, the passer-by might think that it was referring to a paedophile net-work that had just hit town or a drug gang that was setting up shop there. But no! All it was saying was that a legitimate and law-abiding political party, with policies in some ways different to those of the well-known and established parties in the locality, had formed a local branch. So what was the big deal?

Some clue was provided in the report that followed, which said:-

"Politicians from all parties today called on voters to shun the British National Party after it had announced it had formed a branch in the Lothians."

The report went on to say that the BNP had established its new branch at a recent meeting in Bathgate, and it quoted a Labour Member of the Scottish Parliament, Mary Mulligan, as saying:-

"I am absolutely appalled that the BNP should be meeting in Bathgate. But I have every confidence in the people of Bathgate and West Lothian that should they meet the BNP they will tell them they want nothing to do with them and send them away."

But why should Miss Mulligan be appalled? She is entitled to disagree with the BNP, but surely it should not appal her that the party is exercising its right in a free country to hold meetings! Then what's this about sending the BNP away? If the voters reject its policies, fair enough: they'll vote for someone else. But whatever results the BNP gets it won't disappear; it will carry on campaigning until it has won the local electorate over to its point of view. Miss Mulligan would seem to wish that if the

'STOP THE BNP'

Paul Heiney Maccie Hambling Simon Loftus Jill Freud Bill Nighy

Clive Merrison Libby Purves Sir Clive Merrison Diana Quick Peter Purves

Celebrities urge voters to reject far-right party in controversial by-election Full story: Page 5

HYSTERIA IN SUFFOLK

This is from the front page of the *East Anglian Daily Times*. Note the word 'controversial'. In the minds of some people it seems to be a matter of controversy whether the BNP should be allowed to fight elections or not!

party doesn't get lucky first time it'll pack up and head off out of town. Who on earth does the lady think she is?

Meanwhile, hundreds of miles away down in deepest Suffolk a similar mentality seemed to be at work. It had been announced a short while before that the BNP was going to contest the village of Yoxford in a local government election. Once again, what was the big deal? Well, some local residents thought it a very big deal. Leading the way were a number of popular celebrities, including Peter Purves, a former well-known TV host, and actors Bill Nighy, Diana Quick and Clive Merrison. These and others formed a committee in the run-up to the election whose purpose was, in the words of the *East Anglian Daily Times*, "to minimise any risk of the election of the BNP candidate to Suffolk Coastal District Council."

Now again, these various local popular celebrities, together with others on their committee, were quite entitled to disagree

with the policies of the BNP. In that case no one was forcing them to vote for its candidate. But did this justify forming a special committee in order to tell all the other local electors how they should vote? Do local people who support the Tories form committees to go around shouting to everyone that they should not vote for the Liberal Democrats? Or vice-versa? We rather doubt it.

What does all this indicate? It indicates the crazy intolerance of those very people who, no doubt, would claim to represent the forces of 'tolerance'. They really do not think the BNP should be allowed. They would not admit this, but it is the logical inference to be drawn from their attitude. And the newspapers which respectfully quote their hysterical proclamations just play up to them in their ludicrous postures. They are all very rattled and very frightened, and to us that is a compliment.

JEFFREY TURNER